INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 7. (NEW SERIES.)

JULY, 1896.

Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	193
The Cotton Duties, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	198
Indian Troops in the Sudan, by J. Dacosta	200
Indian Revenue and Expenditure, by W. M. J. Williams	201
Education at High Pressure	203
The History of the Transvaal	205
Indian Ideals	207
University Reform in India	208
The Detective as Judge	209
A Complacent Philosopher	210
The Financial Peril	212
Our London Letter	213
Indian Troops in the Sudan: Rumoured Second Thoughts	214
Mr. Morley Speaks Out ..	215
Some Opinions of the Press	216
The Transvaal and India	220
Reviews: Indian Criminal Law	222
Men of the South	223
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects ..	224
Recent Official Publications	224

Indiana.

Mr. Morley Speaks Out.

THE speech which Mr. John Morley delivered at Leeds on June 3rd, at a Conference summoned to consider the policy of the Government in the Sudan, will be remembered in India for many a day to come. No clearer or juster statement of the duty of the House of Commons towards India has ever been made by so prominent and powerful a British statesman. "If," said Mr. Morley, speaking of the members of the House of Commons, "if we are anything, we are the guardians of the interests of the unrepresented natives of India." The sentence was greeted with cheers. Nothing, indeed, is more certain than that popular audiences in the United Kingdom are always ready to endorse the strictest and most unselfish theory of their relations with their Indian fellow-subjects. The pride and prejudice of bureaucratic officers are alien to them. They are just as ready to resent the notion of irresponsible authority in India, when the issue is clearly put before them, as they would be to resent the notion of irresponsible authority at home. When the people, as distinguished from the official class, of India make their appeal to the people, as distinguished from the official class, of the United Kingdom, they find an entirely sympathetic audience. Mr. Morley amplified his memorable phrase as follows:—

"It is even more important that we should recognise our representative duty to them [the people of India] than it is to you, because you can call us, if we displease you, quickly to account. You can make yourselves heard. You can press your views and opinions upon us. But the natives of India cannot."

In other words, every member of the House of Commons, far from neglecting Indian questions because, in the slang of the lobby, there are "no votes behind them," is bound for that very reason to make it a point of honour to attend to them. It is an unexceptionable maxim, and Mr. Morley undoubtedly practises what he preaches. To take only two recent instances, he was one of the foremost champions of the right of the people of India to raise revenue from import duties if they were so minded, and, during the past two months, he has taken the lead in examining and cross-examining the Treasury Bench upon their proposal—of which they now seem to be a little ashamed—to charge upon the Indian revenues the "ordinary" expenses of the Indian troops despatched to the Sudan. We only hope that Mr. Morley's words will be laid to heart both by members of Parliament and by the electors who return them. His words lose none of their significance when it is remembered that only his reluctance to give up the Irish work to which he had set his hand prevented him from becoming Secretary of State for India in the late Government when Lord Kimberley went to the Foreign Office.

The Wit and Wisdom of Sir J. Colomb.

NEEDLESS to say Mr. Morley's theory is not at all the theory of a large section of Anglo-Indian officials. Their theory—which happens, by an odd

coincidence, to be flattering to their own position—is that the whole task of governing India should be left in the undisputed possession of "experts," in other words, of the Government of India reinforced by such Anglo-Indians as, on their return home, are elected by Conservative constituencies to the House of Commons. So complete, indeed, is their faith in their own powers, and their conviction of the incompetence of others, that in India they insist upon combining the functions of detective and magistrate, public prosecutor and criminal judge, revenue officer and Court of Revenue Appeal. This theory of the omniscience and the omnipotence of the "expert," and the ignorance of everybody else, was aptly illustrated a day or two before Mr. Morley spoke. Sir J. Colomb, who, as Morley pleasantly put it, is "not exactly an oracle of wisdom," gave notice of the following motion in the House of Commons:

"To call attention to the over-sea employment of Her Majesty's Indian forces, and to the particular proposal for their employment at Suakin; and to move, that, in view of the want of practical knowledge and administrative experience of India which characterises generally the members of this House, and having regard to the magnitude and complexity of Indian affairs, debates partaking in any sense of a party character relating to arrangements agreed upon by the Government of India and the responsible advisers of Her Majesty are not advantageous to the welfare of the British Empire."

Now, this, as Mr. Morley said, is "a very silly motion," and it provoked great amusement among the good people of Leeds, who do not appear to be awe-struck at the "practical knowledge and administrative experience" by which Sir John Colomb may be said to be "characterised generally." The motion was designed, of course, a double debt to pay. Mr. Balfour had given notice, before the Whitsuntide recess, that on June 4th the motion to authorise the employment of Indian troops in the Sudan would be submitted to the House of Commons. But, in the meantime, the inconvenient contents of the Italian Green-book had become known. Also, the Government of India had protested against the proposal of the Cabinet to charge the "ordinary" expenses of the troops upon the Indian revenues. Accordingly the resolution and the debate were postponed. It was feared, however, that the subject would be brought up on a motion for adjournment, and Sir John Colomb's motion was designed to "block" any such proceedings. It failed in this purpose because it was so badly drawn, and it was so badly drawn because of Sir John Colomb's anxiety to have a dry wipe at independent members who, greatly daring, venture to discuss Indian questions in the House of Commons and even in his august presence.

"A Very Silly Motion."

"We shall be prepared" said Mr. Morley "to debate that motion—that the House of Commons is so ignorant of Indian affairs that we must allow Her Majesty's Government in Downing Street and the Government at Calcutta to do whatever they like." It may be doubted, however, whether Sir John Colomb is prepared to debate it. We venture to think that the motion will be permitted to disappear—not because we doubt for a moment its author's willingness to lecture the House of Commons on its want of practical knowledge and administrative experience, but because if he were to bring the question to debate he would, obviously, be committing the transgression which he so eloquently deplores. The general question has often been discussed in our pages. But there are one or two particular criticisms which Sir J. Colomb's "very silly motion" seems to suggest. He deprecates debates "relating to arrangements agreed upon by the Government of India and the responsible advisers of Her Majesty." Yet, curiously enough, his motion has its ostensible origin in the employment of Indian troops in the Sudan. What, we should like to know, were the "arrangements agreed upon" in this case "by the Government of India and the responsible advisers of Her Majesty"? Why, the whole point of the thing was that no arrangements had been agreed upon at all. Until independent members of the House of Commons, devoid of "practical knowledge and administrative experience of India," had had recourse to Parliamentary questions, the "responsible advisers of Her Majesty," in defiance of the Act of 1858, refrained even from announcing to Parliament the fact that Indian troops had been ordered to Suakin. The Secretary of State for India, and his colleagues in the Cabinet, left the House of Commons to glean that news from Reuter's telegrams, and, even at a later stage, were not only prepared to ignore statutory requirements and to override precedent, but were obviously in a state of sublime, or ridiculous, uncertainty as to the nature of their own intentions. Sir John Colomb could not, we think, have chosen a less opportune occasion to preach the sacrosanct inviolability of "arrangements agreed upon by the Government of India and the responsible advisers of Her Majesty." Sir John Colomb is a zealous, if not a discreet, admirer of the Government of India. Has he forgotten that the unanimous desire of independent members of the House of Commons was, and is, that the representations of the Government of India should be acceded to, and that no charge in respect of the Sudan expedition should fall upon India? What the House of Commons was really doing—and, if rumour may be trusted, not without success—was to strengthen the hands of Lord G. Hamilton against his colleagues in the Cabinet. When Lord Salisbury was Secretary of State for India, he said that the most effectual way of securing financial justice for India was for the House of Commons to be constantly watchful on her behalf.

India and British Parties.

ANOTHER stipulation of Sir J. Colomb's is that debates on Indian affairs must not "partake in any sense of a party character." There is, no doubt, a good deal to be said for this opinion. But against whom, we wonder, is it urged? The Indian Parliamentary Committee, at any rate, has spared no pains to secure the co-operation of members of both parties. We referred last month to the negotiations which preceded the recent debate on Lord G. Hamilton's readjustment of the Indian cotton duties. What happened was that in private conversation "Unionist" members who are also specially acquainted with Indian affairs were quite ready to endorse the representations of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, and were willing to roar like lions against the weakness of Lord G. Hamilton and the selfishness of Lancashire. But when it came to an actual debate they roared like any sucking dove. They were as courageous as so many mice. There they sat, submissive to their party Whips, holding, no doubt, the strongest possible opinions, but too timid to utter even a single word. We do not hesitate to say that if the charge of making debates on Indian affairs "partake of a party character" lies at anybody's door, it lies at the door of these dreadfully nervous Conservatives, who, for party reasons, abstain from saying what they ought to say and what, if only they dared, they would very much like to say. But it is the height of assurance when, having held their tongues and neglected their duty through sheer subservience to their own Front Bench, they rail at independent Liberal members who, no matter whether their party is in office or in opposition, have the courage of their convictions. The Indian Parliamentary Committee would, no doubt, be glad to have the assistance of Sir J. Colomb and his friends in keeping the Secretary of State up to the mark. But Sir J. Colomb and his friends, if we may judge them by their fruits, are utterly indifferent to the interests of India. What are the Indian questions that have been brought before the House of Commons during the present Session? To mention the most important of them, there were, in February, the invasion of Kafiristan, the retention of Chitral (as to which the "experts" are so hopelessly at variance), the heavy rate of mortality in Indian prisons, and the deposition of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar; in March, the employment of Indian troops beyond the frontiers, the Patna and Jhalawar cases, the Durand Treaty, and the Land Revenue System in Madras; in April, the treatment of British Indian subjects in South Africa, the despatch of Indian troops to the Sudan, and the blunder about the Bashgal valley; and in May, Kafiristan again, the occupation of the Malakand Pass, the Indian troops in the Sudan, and the debate on the cotton duties. Yet in all these cases the initiative was left to the Indian Parliamentary Committee, while Sir John Colomb and his friends remained silent.

How not to Argue.

IN this connexion we may dispose of a mare's-nest recently discovered by an Anglo-Indian contemporary. The *Pioneer*, which, like Captain Costigan, is always good-natured and sometimes almost trustworthy, calls attention to what it chooses to regard as an inconsistency in our April number. It seems that, at one and the same time, we congratulated the Indian Parliamentary Committee upon an accession of strength and condemned Lord George Hamilton's re-arrangement of the cotton duties. But where is the inconsistency? If the Indian Parliamentary Committee had been stronger, Lord George Hamilton's iniquitous re-arrangement would never have been made. As it was, it was solely through the efforts of the Indian Parliamentary Committee that the re-arrangement was brought on for discussion in the House of Commons, and the opinions of the people, and the Government, of India obtained a hearing. The *Pioneer* has the assurance, or the humour, to argue that if we protest against bad "legislation forced by England upon the Government of India" we must not applaud and encourage the Indian Parliamentary Committee. Was ever such an argument heard outside Bedlam? It ought to be, but apparently it is not, superfluous to say that "intervention" from London in the affairs of India is neither good nor bad in itself, but that it deserves praise or blame according to the purpose which it has in view.

Another "Frontier" Scare.

THE latest scare about the North-West frontier is developing. From time to time "feelers" are being thrown out to ascertain the state of public opinion with regard to another advance, this time with Kandahar as its immediate objective, in conformity with the half-avowed aim of the forward policy at its great revival in 1876. After sounding the note of alarm, to which attention was called in our last issue, the *Times* has proceeded to suggest openly the continuation of existing lines of railway as far as Kandahar. Before the matter is allowed to go further it may be well to consider in the light of past history what are likely to be the consequences of an advance, and whether the probable results are proportionate to the probable cost. For surely in India, if anywhere, is applicable the principle lately laid down by the Home Government in connexion with the Sudanese campaign, that our advance must be limited by our means (in this case, the means of India) if by no higher considerations. Some few months ago, when the Indian estimates came before

the Council, Sir James Westland took credit to himself for moderation in basing his calculations on a rupee value of 1s. 1¾d., and anticipated a comfortable margin in consequence. His hopes of the maintenance of the value of the rupee have been only imperfectly realised. At present it is worth 1s. 2d. and there is absolutely no guarantee that it will not fall lower, so that no improvement can be looked for in that quarter. An increase of taxation is impossible without serious jeopardy to British power in India, for it is clearly felt that in this incessant frontier warfare Imperial and not Indian interests are at stake, and India is not prepared to make sacrifices to further a policy she disapproves at a time when she is crushed under the burdens imposed upon her in the last twenty years by the action of that policy. Sir Auckland Colvin as Finance Minister in 1885 calculated the normal annual expenditure on the Indian army at less than fifteen millions sterling, or, excluding cost of exchange, Rx.15,000,000; add a million for military works, and Rx.16,000,000 becomes the standard. In the last twenty years the aggregate excess of military expenditure over this standard has amounted to more than 52 millions of tens of rupees. Of this twelve millions were required for the Afghan war. In case the Amír, as is likely, refuses his consent to the continuation of the North-West railway, we may be asked to contemplate a repetition of this expense and of the horrors of Kabul and Kandahar. Nearly 14 millions have been spent on the additions to the military establishment necessitated by the occupation of Quetta after the Penjdeh incident. Four millions went in the annexation of Burma, and the remaining 22 millions were spent in the occupation of Burma, expeditions, etc. During the last eleven years alone the item of minor expeditions has accounted for no less than 7¾ millions of tens of rupees, including the cost of the Chitral blunder, which alone reached 2¼ millions.

The Russian Spectre.

IT would not be difficult to show that this fatuous pursuit of an impossible frontier, originated by a purely military clique for the usual reasons, has cost India much more than the accounts indicate. A reversal of policy would not only mean the reduction of these extra charges, but a decrease of the standard cost also. But even as they stand the figures form a terrible indictment against the Indian Government. It cannot with any plausibility be maintained that this enormous expenditure has benefited India in the remotest degree. It has been incurred solely to advance a policy based on imaginary Imperial interests, and inspired by a fear of the Russian bogey, in which India has no part beyond paying the cost. Both Indians and Anglo-Indians, not excepting the bulk of the civil servants who see the fruits of their labour squandered in the mountains of Afghanistan, are agreed as to the hopelessness of anything like a serious invasion on the North-West frontier, and the futility of this panic advance. But thanks to the system which provides for a preponderance of the military element in the Council the military clique at Simla is enabled to override all sane opinion, and wage war for its own glory at the expense of India. Surely the barest justice seems to dictate that if an offshoot of the British Government wishes to wage war to safeguard imaginary British interests the British Government should bear the cost. If the Imperial Exchequer were saddled with the expense and the British taxpayer could thereby be roused to take an interest in these proceedings the rule of the Simla clique could not endure for a day. Unless, however, the Royal Commission now sitting falsifies the very moderate hopes we have been led to entertain by the conduct hitherto of its enquiry into Indian expenditure, it is to be feared that reform will be delayed until British opinion receives some rude shock to rouse it from its lethargy. Meanwhile the Russophobist policy proceeds, involving a steady and continual drain of men and treasure, drawing the army ever farther from its base into wastes where even railway communication is unreliable, as experience has shown in the Quetta district, creating discontent and increasing the oppressive taxation of a poverty-stricken and long-suffering people, and entailing finally beyond all doubt some renewal of the troubles of 1842 and 1878.

Simla's Nightmares.

THE fallacy which underlies the whole position of the Russophobists is an entire misconception of the lines of Russian policy. Other European nations are by their position forced to admit conflicting considerations in determining their policy. Russia, as isolated almost as England, in spite of her South-Western frontier, is able to consult entirely her own interests. In spite, therefore, of all that has been said about the duplicity of Russian diplomacy, her course of action can under any given circumstances be predicted with much greater accuracy than is possible in the case of any other foreign nation. She will in all cases act so as to secure her own advantage, and her advance, whenever she does advance, will follow the line of least resistance. Assuredly that line does not pass through the highlands of Afghanistan. Already in 1842 Russia had perceived the extreme sensibility of England to threatened assaults on the North-West frontier and the frantic energy with which she threw herself into the work of securing India against such assaults. The result of the first Afghan war taught her how she might always engage England's attention and seduce her into the

vain expenditure of men and money. She was not slow to profit by her knowledge. When in 1878 Lord Beaconsfield, having brought the country to the verge of war, ordered Indian troops to Malta, Russia replied to his threats by intrigues at Kabul which the Government allowed to involve them in the disastrous war of 1878 to 1880. Again in 1885, acting no doubt in the interests of her friend and ally, France, she arranged the famous Penjdeh incident which caused the hurried abandonment of the Sudan in order that the troops might be set free for a possible Russian war. In neither case did she intend to push matters to extremities; that would have injured her interests. The history of the last three years alone is sufficient to illustrate the absolute selfishness of her policy, which is the best guarantee for the inviolability of the North-West frontier. She has utilised her friendship with France to secure her position in the Far East, the real goal of her ambition, and in return has granted her ally the privilege of floating her loans. It is clearly understood that France cannot rely on her aid in any attempt to avenge her defeat of 1870, and it ought to be equally clear, to all who care to see, that Russia has no intention of risking a war with England to please her ally. At the present time the position of 1885 is reproduced. England is engaged once more in an attempt to conquer the Sudan, and France, now a power in Central Africa, feels more than ever that her position is threatened by the continued occupation of Egypt, and the presence of Egyptian troops led by Englishmen in the Equatorial Provinces. So she claims the support of Russia to aid her in foiling British intrigues, and that support she will obtain so far as is consistent with Russia's material advantages. In the matter of the Caisse de la Dette, which involves England in a certain amount of embarrassment, France has received the unqualified support of her ally, for there such support can involve her in no further liability. The feint on Herat is but a well-timed replica of the Penjdeh affair arranged with a view to check the transport of Indian troops for use in the Sudan. But there should be no doubt as to its real character. If there should become evident a desire on the part of England to retain her African conquests as compensation for the expense she seems likely to incur, the railway towards Herat will be pressed on. But it is none the less impossible that Russia should meditate an invasion in order to create a diversion in favour of France. Still an opportunity will be afforded to the Simla authorities to create another scare, organise another expedition, and annex another batch of honours and decorations. Therefore it cannot be too soon or too strongly emphasised that this new alarm is as groundless as its predecessors, and that Simla's nightmares must not be allowed to add another rupee to the already overwhelming burden under which India is struggling.

Indian Sea-borne Trade.

W. M. W. writes:—"Herewith are presented the totals of Indian over-sea commerce, for the year ending with March last, and the two previous years. The figures, derived directly from the official returns, are set out somewhat differently from the forms usually adopted in English and in Indian journals. Our object is to bring out, more clearly than is done by the usual method, the one great factor which dominates India's position as a trading country. That factor, the perennial excess of India's exports, is often conspicuous by its absence from articles on Indian commerce.

SEA-BORNE TRADE OF BRITISH INDIA.

MERCHANDISE AND TREASURE.

	1895-6		1894-5		1893-4
	Rx.		Rx.		Rx.
Exports	118,606,000	..	117,140,000	..	110,604,000
Imports	86,304,000	..	83,110,000	..	93,483,000
India's Excess of Exports	Rx. 32,302,000		Rx. 34,030,000		Rx. 17,119,000

The *net* Imports of Treasure in the three years (the totals on both sides being included in the above) were in millions Rx.:—

9·13 1·40 14·41

It will be observed that the net imports of treasure in 1894-5 were abnormally small. This circumstance was due to the unusual export of gold from India in that year, amounting to Rx. 4·97, as against net import of silver Rx. 6·37. The explanation of this outflow of the yellow metal from India in that period must be sought for mainly in the peculiar course of the bullion market in the western world, the chief feature of which was the enhanced appreciation of gold. There was also the effect of the closing of the Indian Mints, with the subtle variations affecting silver primarily, but chiefly, as will be noticed, sending the flow of gold back to the west. These special currents, as affecting the monetary and commercial affairs of India, need not be traced here at present.

The Excess of Indian Exports.

"WHAT in these figures most broadly and deeply concerns the current 'Condition of India' question is the large excess of her exports, amounting in the year closed on March 31st last to thirty-two and a-half crores of rupees. In the three years before us that excess amounts to the immense aggregate of Rx.83½ millions —sent or drawn out of India, for which no commercial or monetary return was received or is receivable. City editors using the customary phrase, as applied to independent States of the West, may continue to speak of this excess of exports as 'the balance of trade in favour of' India. But economists or statesmen who look at the matter from the Indian standpoint can only regard that phrase as bitterly ironical. Any 'favour' there may be in this net adverse result

of India's trading transactions pertains mainly to the United Kingdom, which absorbs most of this never repaid excess of India's exports. As to details of this last year's Indian trade, one or two points of slight relief may be noted: thus the imports were 3¼ crores more than in 1894-5, and the exports of Indian manufactured cottons to the Far East had nearly recovered the set-back attributed to the adverse influence of the closing of the mints. On the other hand the imports of cotton goods from the West had not reached the high level of the two years before the imposition of the duties; but Lancashire is now rapidly making up its normal volume of exports to India. Though it is interesting to note these and similar fluctuations, they have little or only intermittent bearing on the essential facts of India's foreign commerce."

THE COTTON DUTIES.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

"It is admitted by everyone," Lord George Hamilton told a deputation of gentlemen interested in the Lancashire cotton trade, on the 11th of December last, "that, excepting perhaps the ties which race and religion may weave, the bonds of commerce are the most powerful instruments known for holding together the interests of scattered communities and of welding them together in an Empire. But if trade and commerce are so to work," he went on to say, "they must operate equally for the interests which they touch, and, whenever it is in any way necessary to adopt a tariff policy which sets great industrial communities in different parts of the world in the same Empire in antagonism or collision one with another, then the germs of disunion are created and the stability of that Empire is threatened." Then there emerges what Lord Salisbury called a matter of dangerous contention. Unhappily there is no doubt about the danger. But then if the doctrine is applicable to India, how much more applicable is it to the Colonies? Yet, somehow or other, the official Conservative mind regards with complacency, undisturbed by any menace to the stability of the Empire, such "germs of disunion" as the imposition and maintenance of hostile tariffs by any or all of the Colonial Governments. Again, what an abject slavery to words and to official cant it is to talk of the "welding together" of the interests of India and England in such a fashion as this! If India were in the freer position of a self-governing Colony, she would maintain the cotton duties, and she would not tolerate for a moment a single *pie* of countervailing excise. England is supposed to govern India for India's good—not for the good of Lancashire; yet, in this matter of cotton duties, India is controlled expressly in the supposed interests of Lancashire. And what a wretched peddling the whole business is! Instead of preventing the necessity for the reimposition of the cotton duties at all, the great wise and eminent legislators and administrators of the time are posing as laborious statesmen in the twopenny-halfpenny balancing of a trumpery excise—trumpery enough for England—against the chances of some possible atom of advantage to India, whose interests are totally diverse and incomparably more seriously affected.

Sir Henry Fowler, however, laid down the principle that there must be no element of protection in the operation of the cotton duties, and Lord George Hamilton must maintain the traditional continuity of policy. Thanks to the independent, not to say magnanimous, attitude of the Indian millowners and merchants, the quarrel on this point is to some extent modified. "The history of the past ten or fifteen years," said Sir James Westland,

> "shows that Indian industries in a fair field and without any adventitious aid can even more than hold their own; and mill-owners and merchants in India are at one in declaring that they want no special terms of any kind, no treatment in which Manchester is not admitted to a perfectly equal share."

True, Lancashire trade has been suffering from depression. True, also that such depression has not been to any great extent due to the Indian cotton duties. Still, as the Finance Minister put it, "whatever may be the immediate future of the Lancashire industry, it behoves us to be careful that none of its misfortunes—if any such should be in store—be in any way attributable to any unequal action on our part." Now, this attitude would be completely satisfactory—for the moment at least—if cotton spinners and cotton merchants were the only parties whose interests are involved. But, unfortunately, this is not the case. Sir James Westland properly dealt with the question "on the assumption that the tax, whatever it is, falls upon and is paid by the Indian consumer," and he justly castigated the economic heresy of "much of the language held in Manchester," which seemed "to indicate a belief that the tax really falls upon the producer there." But it was left to Mr. Playfair and the native members to point out the true effect of the Bills—the Cotton Duties and Tariff Bills, 1896—before the Legislative Council.

> "The proposals under these Bills," said Mr. Playfair, "mean a remission of taxation of Rs. 51½ lakhs (or 37 per cent.) on Manchester goods and an increase of Rs. 11 lakhs (or 300 per cent.) of taxation on Indian-made goods. . . . . It is a transfer of taxation from the richer to the poorer classes of the community, that is not required for fiscal considerations, that is not warranted when a surplus in the finances is available, and I may add that the annoyance is intensified by the knowledge that this shifting of taxation cannot be of the least benefit to Lancashire."

To the same effect spoke Mr. Bhuskate.

> "Millions," he said, "will have to buy their coarse cloth at an unnecessarily higher price which is sure to tell heavily on their impoverishment. Those who are best able to pay for a tax, and that, too, in proportion to their higher comfort, will have their tax reduced, and the deficit will be filled up by the poorest, all other circumstances remaining the same."

Such is substantially the plain effect of these unfortunate and oppressive Cotton Duties and Tariff Acts of 1896.

The importance of this view, if it be the correct view, drew from Sir James Westland an elaborate attempt at refutation. The statement that "the effect of our legislation is to relieve from taxation the richer classes of India, and put upon the

poorer classes a burden which they are not at present liable to bear" is, he argued, "entirely without foundation, unless we accept the theory that the cotton goods imported from Manchester are wholly consumed by a certain class called the richer class, and the goods manufactured in India are wholly consumed by another class called the poorer class." Sir James says the bulk of the consumers both of Manchester and of Indian goods is the middle class, the "85 per cent. of the population" that are "well enough off to pass, without any relief from the State, through the worst of famines" and are in fact "really fairly well off according to their own lights, their own traditions, and their own standards." Such reliance on official statistics is quite heroic. Such a description of the condition of the bulk of the population of India could not be accepted by any observer but an official labouring under some overmastering compulsion; and no reader of these columns will require a repetition of the facts that forbid its acceptance. But apart from that, the form of statement of the opposing view exhibits an ingenuity of dialectic worthy of a Greek sophist or of a mediæval schoolman. Look at the plain facts. Before these Acts were passed, the duty stood at 5 per cent. assessed upon yarns of counts 20s and upwards. After the Acts passed, the duty stood at 3½ per cent. assessed upon woven goods of all counts. The reduction of the amount of duty relieves the pockets of those that are able to purchase the finer counts; the extension of the duty to counts under 20s brings a fresh tax upon those that cannot afford the finer counts. If some 85 per cent. of the population are agricultural labourers, and something like a half of them, not to put it higher, are constantly on the brink of famine and starvation, it is easy enough to see how the new arrangement will work out in practice. Even in the case of those that use both Manchester and Indian cloths, the additional pressure will obviously inflict hardship. Sir James Westland himself in moving for leave to introduce the Bills, had largely admitted, as he was bound to do, the substance of his opponents' contention when he pointed to the reduction of the duty from 5 per cent. to 3½ as a counterbalancing consideration to "this addition to the taxation that has to be paid in part at least by the poorer classes in India." It was not quite worthy of his fairness to exercise his dialectic on the word "classes," which he had himself used, or to represent in such rosy colours the material condition of the mass of the population.

It is worth while to reproduce Sir James Westland's statement of the attitude of the contending parties in the difficult and delicate matter of finding even a temporarily tolerable adjustment. The people n England ought to read, mark, and inwardly digest his:

"First, Manchester has systematically refused all informa-on regarding the trade; it has left us to ferret out all the acts for ourselves. Secondly, it has not helped us by one ngle suggestion as to how to meet the difficulties inherent in he matter . . . . except the financially impracticable one to bolish the duties altogether.

"The Bombay millowners, besides giving us a mass of helpful information, discuss some of the possible ways of meeting difficulties which they admit are not easy of satisfactory solution."

Yet the Manchester men believed themselves to be suffering from an intolerable grievance that had "inflicted serious injury" on their trade and constituted a dire menace to their future, while the Bombay men were equally satisfied that the grievance of Manchester was substantially fictitious and the remedy demanded essentially unjust to India. The contrast forms a painful element in the recent Blue-book. The drastic handling of the Manchester case by the Bombay critics leaves it a thing of mere rags and tatters. It is impossible to go into the details here. They stand on permanent record in the Blue-book, and are well worthy of careful study.

For this question is by no means finally settled. India has been coerced. "If I could see any hope of finality in the proposals," said Sir Griffith Evans, "I might accept the proposals even as I have often advised a client to abandon some part of what I thought were his strict legal rights to avoid a doubtful and hazardous litigation of which I could not foresee the issue." Lancashire makes i s claim on the principle of free trade; the Government is handicapped by "the pressure of the semi-pledges of members of its party;" and the nation at large has no effective grasp of the facts of the situation. "The Government of India, in conducting the case, so to speak, for India, not without reason thinks it is worth some sacrifice and some concession to put the matter on such a basis that the point shall be conspicuous and indisputable." But the sense of injustice and the pressure upon the people still remain, and are bound to work out their natural results. Sir Griffith Evans briefly indicated two or three points of very serious importance:

"First, it is proposed to *sacrifice about 40 lakhs of revenue from the cotton duties*. I am not in a position to question the statement of the financial member that he is able to budget for a surplus considerably above this amount. But the spectre of famine is beginning to loom in the North-West, and exchange is uncertain, and it is most inadvisable to part with 40 lakhs of revenue which is raised without the consumer of the cotton goods feeling that he pays it—without discontent or annoyance. We shall never again be able to get it back when we need it, as we soon may, and *we may be driven to direct taxation, which in India means discontent*.

"Second, *the money is wanted for the development o' the country*, and, even if it could be spared for remission of taxation, it ought to be applied to relieve the poorer classes from the income tax, which sorely oppresses them, as pointed out by Mr. Stevens last March. . . . .

"Third, pending adjustment of the markets, it is said by the Bombay millowners that the excise under 20s will cause a heavy temporary loss to the Indian mills, which the weaker ones may be unable to stand. Whether this is so or not, I am not certain, but *it s certain hey believe it, and are smarting under a sense of injustice*; there will, at any rate, be *a large remission of indirect taxation on the ell-to-do, and an imposition of taxation on the poorer classes*, so far as they consume the coarser goods of the Indian mills. . . . .

"Fourth, we are asked to *p otect the hand-loom weavers by a 3½ per cent. duty, both against the Indian and Lancashire power-looms*. . . . . The figures produced by the Bombay millowners go to show that the hand-looms produce two-thirds of the cloth woven in India, as against one-third produced by power-looms; and the census tells a similar tale from the number of weavers. If this be so, the Indian power looms may receive a severe shock, and be more or less crippled by a 3½ per cent. protection to hand-looms. Moreover, in many places, I am informed, the hand-loom weavers weave from finer imported yarns. If this be so, we shall in endeavouring to free Lancashire from an imaginary indirect protection, create a direct protection against her in favour of the hand-looms. What practical effect this may have I have no means

of judging, but I clearly see that Lancashire will not be slow in availing herself of this argument, and will probably join hands with the Indian millowners in abolishing the duties imposed by this Bill as being directly protective. I do not see what answer we shall have to this argument, as the permission to impose the duties is conditional on the total elimination of direct protection."

There is more than enough matter here to suggest the gravest doubts as to the stability of the present settlement; and there is much more behind. Furthermore, it is to be remembered that the whole difficulty is part of the price we have to pay for a "spirited policy" of military adventure on the borders of the Indian Empire. To repeat the words of Lord George Hamilton, "the germs of disunion are created, and the stability of that Empire is threatened." When will our legislators and administrators recognise that the safety of the Indian Empire lies within, and not without, its territorial borders—in the real prosperity and contentment of the people, and not in any other consideration whatsoever?

INDIAN TROOPS IN THE SUDAN.

BY J. DACOSTA.

Within the last sixty years the safety of our rule in India has twice been jeopardised through the misuse of power by the officials entrusted with the control of our Indian administration. During the rule of the East India Company the tendency to act arbitrarily was restrained by the risk it involved of the Company forfeiting its privileges: but when the Board of Control on Indian affairs was created with a member of the British Government as its president the British Cabinet became practically a dominant partner in the Indian administration. From that time the restraint on the exercise of arbitrary power in Indian affairs was seriously impaired, and national misfortunes ensued in due course from the abuse of official authority.

The calamitous Afghan war of 1838-42, in which an entire British army was slaughtered and a heavy burden of debt imposed on the Indian taxpayer, was the work of the British Cabinet carried on through the instrumentality of the Board of Control. It was the first time, as the historian observed, that the people of India saw that British soldiers were not invincible. Furthermore the bloody mutinies of 1857-58, during which British rule in India trembled in the balance for upwards of a year, and great additional burdens of debt were imposed on our Indian fellow-subjects, were likewise the fruit of the disastrous policy of arbitrary annexation and confiscation, which the Government pursued with the aid of the Board of Control through the agency of Lord Dalhousie.

Painful as it is to recall these sad and humiliating events, it becomes a duty to remember them when the abuse of authority and the exercise of arbitrary power once more threaten India with their dire and inevitable consequences.

As regards the disasters just referred to, no official connected with the Government of India was summoned to answer for any share in their originating causes; and the impunity thus enjoyed by officers whose guilty acts had sown the seed of our misfortunes, necessarily encouraged their successors to tread the same unconstitutional path. The disasters were ascribed, not to any deviation by officers from the line of duty, but simply to the vicious system which ruled our Indian administration. Sweeping changes were therefore made in that system, with the view of allaying the national irritation and alarm which had prevailed during our troubles. The East India Company and the Board of Control were abolished and the Queen assumed the government of her Indian possessions through a Principal Secretary of State, a semblance of the governing machinery of the United Kingdom being thus imparted to the new system. The similarity however is entirely deceptive, seeing that the Secretaries charged with the government of the United Kingdom are responsible to Parliament where the people of that Kingdom have representatives to defend their interests, while the Secretary charged with the government of her Majesty's Indian possessions is responsible only to the British Parliament where the people of those possessions have no representative. The power vested in the Indian Secretary thus became virtually an irresponsible power.

It is true that clauses in the Act of Parliament by which the change of system was effected purport to restrict the Indian Secretary's authority within constitutional bounds; but other clauses of that Act and its context have been interpreted by the official just mentioned as neutralising the restrictions in question; whereby the danger inseparable from the exercise of irresponsible power has been completely revived.

We are proud to proclaim that the British Constitution requires taxation and popular representation to go hand in hand. At the same time we suffer those whose duty it is to uphold that Constitution, to violate its principle by conniving at two hundred and fifty millions of British subjects in India being taxed without representation, and deprived moreover of the protection which Parliament specially designed to confer upon them, when it enacted in 1858 that,

"except for repelling actual invasion or under sudden and urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applicable to defray the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond her external frontier, by her Majesty's forces charged upon the Indian revenues."

Now we have not only connived at the revenues of India being applied, continuously since 1876, to defray the expenses of military operations carried on beyond the Indian frontier, without the existence of the urgent necessity specified in the Act; but we are, at the present moment, conniving at her Majesty's forces charged on those revenues, being employed in Africa for the territorial aggrandisement of Egypt and the Turkish Empire, in flagrant violation of the Act referred to.

Recent statements in Parliament show that officials (with whose concurrence Indian troops are being employed in Africa) hold that such employment does not contravene section LV of the Act *for the better government of India*, simply because some extraordinary expense of the expedition might eventually fall on the Imperial exchequer.

Thus, on May 11th, Lord George Hamilton said:

"The apportionment between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India, of the expenses of the troops despatched to Suakin, is under consideration";

and the Chancellor of the Exchequer said:

"I do not see the necessity of stating whether any or what part of the charges of these troops will be placed on the Imperial exchequer."

On May 12th Lord George Hamilton said:

"According to precedent no Resolution is necessary for the employment of Indian troops outside India, unless a charge is imposed on the Indian revenues for the purpose."

This view was supported by Mr. Balfour, who said:

"In point of actual law there is no obligation under the statute to have the assent of Parliament unless some extra charge is thrown upon the Indian finances";

and the same gentleman said the next day:

"The view of the Government—at least my view—on the the legal point is that there is no obligation to bring forward a Resolution in this House, if India is only charged with the ordinary expenses."

The interpretation of the Statute implied in these statements obviously stultifies its purport and ignores its intention. The interpretation clearly assumes that troops whose ordinary expenses—*i.e.*, whose recruitment, training, equipment, pay, and general maintenance, are defrayed from the revenues of India, are not in the sense of that Statute "forces charged on Indian revenues," so long as some extraordinary expense of the operation in which they are employed, might, at some future period, be defrayed from some other source.

Then, as regards the intention of the Statute, it is doubtless evident to the general public that Parliament, in enacting that troops maintained on the revenues of India should not, without urgent necessity, be employed in ventures beyond her frontier, intended that the revenues paid by her people should be applied to the protection and other wants of their country, and not be diverted to defray charges involved in the conquest of foreign territories.

There is also this great peril in the interpretation of the Statute suggested by the above-mentioned officials, that, if it be accepted, it would (logically, though only by sophistical logic) authorise the British Cabinet to involve the nation in actual warfare without applying to Parliament for supplies, whereby the first principle of the British Constitution—a principle on the strict observance of which we rely for the peace and safety of our country—would be rudely violated.

The *Times* of June 23rd published an important communication from Mr. John Marshall, Secretary to the Bombay Millowners' Association. With reference to Lord G. Hamilton's recent statement that "there were in the Native States, Berar, and the French Settlements of India nine cotton mills, containing 1,613 looms, as compared with 127 mills, containing 27,749 looms, in British India," Mr. Marshall wrote: "The facts are that there are 2,541 looms in non-British territory and 32,797 looms in British territory in India. The former number does not include looms in mills in the Berars, which, surely the Secretary of State for India knows, are British provinces, so far as taxation is concerned, and should not, therefore, be included as outside of British India."

INDIAN REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

By W. M. J. Williams.

India is at present prominent in the British Parliament, the despatch of troops to Suakin raising great questions, among them that of cost. It may therefore be of interest to give a *conspectus* of the Revenue and Expenditure of the Government of India, including the money received and disbursed in London on behalf of India. To avoid any difficulty, should discrepancies arise in some of the figures it is necessary to supply, let it be said at once that these arise from the fact that the Indian Government Accounts are most complex, and are generally presented comprising a period of three years, much like an *exercisio* in some national accounts, with the result that the figures for any year are finally evolved from the chrysalitic state in which they are first presented as estimates, to pass on to revised estimates as the second state, and to appear ultimately as the account. This may be unavoidable, but eminently confusing. But, in any case, it will only be possible to give a mere summary of the vast and complex subject.

The gradual unfolding of the account is shown in brief as follows:

Gross Revenue and Expenditure.	Account 1893-4	Revised Estimate, 1894-5	Budget Estimate, 1895-6
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Revenue	90,565,214	95,154,100	96,924,300
Expenditure chargeable thereon.. ..	92,112,212	94,163,600	96,878,100
Surplus (+) or Deficit (—) ..	—1,546,998	+ 990,500	+ 46,200

The Net Revenue and Expenditure, explained below, is then given for this period:

Net Revenue and Expenditure.	Account 1893-4	Revised Estimate, 1894-5	Budget Estimate, 1895-6
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Net Revenue	50,328,023	53,738,300	53,948,500
Net Expenditure ..	51,875,021	52,747,800	53,902,000
(+ or —) ..	—1,546,998	+ 990,500	+ 46,200

The gross Revenue and Expenditure includes the accounts of various departments such as Post Office, Telegraphs, Railways, Army, etc., whose receipts and disbursements are given in a table below, showing the gross summary for 1894-5. The Net Revenue and Expenditure is found by omitting the accounts of these services and regarding only the revenue derived from taxes and the land, and opium. This net revenue is said in the "Explanatory Memorandum" to give "a clearer view of the financial condition" of the country than the gross revenue, and is defined as the "amount received from the principal sources after deducting the cost of collection," net expenditure "being the charges of the various departments after deducting the receipts of those departments."

But in order to obtain a view of the whole field of revenue and expenditure we now give a General

Account for the year 1894-5. Notice that it is a final account:

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, YEAR ENDING MARCH, 1895.

Revenue—Principal Heads:	Rx.	Rx.
Land Revenue ..	25,408,272	
Opium	7,323,757	
Salt	8,665,749	
Stamps	4,625,680	
Excise	5,527,676	
Customs	3,854,955	
Other Heads ..	8,179,032	
		63,585,121
Interest		815,061
Post Office, Telegraph and Mint ..		2,645,618
Receipts by Civil Departments ..		1,628,960
Miscellaneous		1,227,019
Railways		21,244,160
Irrigation		2,338,815
Buildings and Roads		692,477
Receipts by Military Departments ..		1,010,197
Total Revenue ..		Rx. 95,187,429

There were Banking transactions regarding the Debts and Bills of the Government which, together with the Balances, made the receipts a grand total of Rx. 144,713,450.

Expenditure—	Rx.
Direct demands on the Reveuue ("principal heads")	9,722,041
Interest	5,124,017
Post Office, Telegraph and Mint ..	2,466,175
Salaries and Expenses of Civil Departments	14,835,209
Miscellaneous Civil Charges	6,065,705
Famine Relief and Insurance ..	610,235
Construction of Railways (in addition to that under "Famine") ..	19,609
Railway Revenue Account	23,592,649
Irrigation	2,952,780
Buildings and Roads	5,352,801
Army Services	24,096,091
Special Defence Works	217,867
Total	95,055,179
Add and *Deduct* Provincial Surpluses and Deficits: (+ Rx. 193,912 and — Rx. 754,772)	— 560 860
Total charges against Revenue ..	Rx. 94,494,319

Corresponding Banking adjustments bring the total Expenditure to the same sum as the Revenue side of the account, but it should be noted that in this balance appears an item as follows:—"Capital Outlay on Railways and Irrigation Works—Rx. 4,446,421." This item is practically an addition to the debt, the *corpus* of which may be judged by the Rx. 5,124,017 devoted to pay the interest upon it.

The more the above General Account is studied the more confusing and unsatisfactory does the previous table of Net Revenue and Expenditure become as an informing account. After a comparison of several documents drawn up from varying points of view, it is found that Net in this little table means the difference between the Rx. 63,585,121 on the revenue side and the Rx. 9,722,041 given on the other side as "Direct demands on the Revenue," which we mark as referring to "principal heads of revenue." Leaving out of sight for the moment the official remark that "a clearer view of the financial condition" may be got from this table, we find that it is practically worthless as an indication of income raised from the taxpayer. The receipts from land revenue for 1894-5 are set down as Rx. 25,408,272, but on enquiry it is found that Rx. 4,048,132 is charged for general management. In the same way, as regards opium, out of Rx. 7,323,757 Rx. 1,616,105 went for management, and a false view of the financial position may be taken, as indeed of the general position, if so highly attenuated an abstract of net revenue and expenditure be regarded. It tends to draw attention from the vital matter of expenditure. It also loses sight of the deduction made from the people's resources for public purposes. A far better and much clearer view of income and expense is got from a return which was first prepared in 1894, at the instance of Sir Henry Fowler, similar to that which he suggested for the British accounts. This return for 1894-5, now to hand, seeks to give the net income and expenditure by deducting from the above gross amounts of Rx. 95,000,000 and Rx. 94,490,000 respectively the departmental receipts and disbursements together with certain refunds, assignments, etc., and the cost of preparing the opium, leaving the cost of the vast establishments of the land and opium revenue, together with that of other administrative departments in the account. The result of treating the above "general account" in this way may be seen as follows:

	Rx.		Rx.
REVENUE—Gross ..	95,187,429	EXPENDITURE—Gross	94,494,319
Deduct—Departmental Receipts	31,602,308	*Deduct* the same items as on other side, but add the Rx. 470,785 treated as Income	34,534,533
Total from "Principal Heads" ..	63,585,121		
Deduct—Refunds, etc., and Cost of Opium Cultivation ..	3,403,010		
	60,182,111		
Add—Net Miscellaneous Receipts	470,785		
Total Net Income .. Rx.	60,652,896	Total Net Expenditure .. Rx.	59,959,786

Such a result, adding over 13 per cent. to the figures of the other net statement, is a much fairer and better representation of income and expenditure, of the cost and burden of governing India apart from the departments contributing to revenue. No good object is served by making a distinction between revenue and income, making the first prominent, while the latter is partly hidden.

What then, is to be said of the "financial condition" of India? One must speak modestly, seeing that the much debated question is now being investigated in London by a Royal Commission. Also in this short inspection of a large and very complex question only the most general deductions can be given. The income and expenditure as a whole, regardless for the occasion of its relation to the different governments and dependencies of India in the field of observation. "The clear view of the financial position" of which the official speaks, which he gets by eliminating all but the money he gets into his hand from taxes after the establishment has been

paid for, may be clear, but it is very partial—wholly inadequate. "Financial condition" in his sense should be more properly called fiscal, a subject of great interest. "Financial condition" of India is another and a far larger, deeper, most profoundly important question. To divert attention from this larger prospect to the Government income from taxes and the land and opium revenue may be of use in estimating the fiscal condition of India. But surely it is on the surface of the question, that the services of the railways, post, and telegraphs, and the military department should be taken into account in estimating the financial condition of the Indian empire. "Apart from other considerations," we are told, the revenue and expenditure are "continually increasing through the opening of additional railways and canals" and so for the "clearer view" we had better confine our attention to the net figures given in the second table above. The "clearer view" seems intended for short-sighted persons. A vital question in estimating the condition from a financial point of view is to know something of the "other considerations" than the figures of the railways and canals. The "Fowler" Return enables us to give a few comparative figures. Looking to the *revenue* (apart from the departmental accounts) we find that since 1884-5 to 1894-5 the receipts have increased from Rx. 47,180,749 to Rx. 60,652,896, or 25 per cent. But of this opium, which was Rx. 5,849,140 in the former year, in 1894-5 had declined to Rx. 5,702,558. The receipts from land, forests, and tributary States increased from Rx.22,634,253 to Rx 26.670,177 or about 16½ per cent. The receipts from the taxes, as distinguished from land and opium revenue increased meanwhile from Rx.18.154,111 to Rx 27.809,376 or nearly 54 per cent. Of this last item the salt tax is a part showing an increase from Rx. 6,081,592 to Rx.8,291,929 or nearly 37 per cent. Customs rose from Rx 990,088 to Rx 3,757,433, or nearly 280 per cent. of increase. In like manner excise increased from Rx.3,953,064 to Rx.5,444,206, or about 39 per cent. Here we have a clue to the trend of affairs, for while population grew from 1881 to 1891, about 11½ per cent., the taxation grew in a decade from '84 to '95 by 54 per cent. Again turning to expenditure on the net basis of Sir Henry Fowler, we find in the same decade a total increase from Rx.47,180,749 to Rx. 59,959,786, or over 27 per cent. Analysing this again we find that of the commercial services, the post office, and the telegraphs now more than pay their way. Railways which in 1884-5 cost a net Rx. 1,051,751 to revenue, now involve a loss of Rx.2,348,489; and irrigation works which involved a loss of Rx.573,017 now require Rx.613,965. The annual expenditure to meet the interest on debt has risen from Rx 3,907,848 to Rx.4,308,955, or over 10 per cent., though it has meantime been less than the 1884-5 charge. The collection of revenne has grown from Rx 5,116,137 to Rx.6,319,031 or over 23 per cent. The net expense on the civil services went up from Rx.19,032,924 to Rx.22,313,571, over 17 per cent. On the military services, the net cost of which was Rx.17,057,865, there was spent in 1894-95 Rx.24,252,058, or over 42 per cent. Here also we get a further clue to the trend of affairs in India. It does not lie within the province of this paper to discuss the policy enshrined in this financial survey. But it is clear that it will not do to confine attention to the net abstracts of Indian finance if one is to get the "clearer view of the financial condition." Policy and expenditure, of course, have a determining influence on the condition of affairs. The contents of that policy as enshrined in the expenditure and the financial measures taken to meet it, are of the utmost importance in considering the general financial condition. From such an examination one comes forth with the conviction that much is necessary by way of examination of Indian affairs and that the Royal Commission was not appointed a moment too soon.

EDUCATION AT HIGH PRESSURE.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

The abuses exposed and the grievances ventilated in the columns of India are many and varied, but none, I imagine, is more disastrous in its consequences than the system of higher education for which the University authorities in India are responsible. It is in some cases undermining the constitutions of the young, in others it unhinges their minds, and it finally produces a youth whose chief merit is superficiality, and who, after hard labour and incessant "cram" for eight to ten years, can scarcely be called an educated man.

The other day an official complained to me that a graduate whom he had but recently employed as clerk was unable to copy out an official letter without making a mistake in every other sentence he wrote, and as to conversing with him in English, he found that it saved time and temper if he carried on his conversation in the vernacular. I informed the official that his experience was by no means singular, as there was a large number of graduates to whom the same remarks might with truth be applied, but that very little blame attached to these men, for they were all the unfortunate victims of a system of education which could only be fitly described as monstrous. Not long ago a friend of mine who displayed keen anxiety that his son should have a distinguished career at the University came to me for advice. He was afraid the health of the young boy was being gradually undermined by arduous study. I could only put to my friend the two alternatives—(i) to give his son prolonged rest and give up the idea of his having a "brilliant career," or (ii) to be prepared to offer him a sacrifice to the pernicious system under which higher education is carried on in India. Unfortunately this was not an isolated case. Any Principal or Professor of a College will bear testimony to the fact that every year many promising students break down through overwork. Meantime, many of the hundreds who become full-fledged B.A.'s and M.A.'s are men in whom has been "crammed" a certain amount of superficial knowledge, pertaining to a large variety of subjects, without their having attained proficiency in any one of them. Nor would it be correct to say that their intellectual or thinking powers have been

greatly developed. Rather I should imagine that they have been stunted and dwarfed by the undue exercise of one faculty, for the memory is often developed to an extraordinary extent at the expense of the other faculties.

In India the Universities are merely examining bodies, or corporations for conferring degrees. They exercise no direct influence on the education and training of young men. The examiners may be most intellectual, amiable and high-minded men, but inasmuch as they never come into contact with the candidates, their influence is lost. It is the colleges which educate and train the young mind, and the professors and teachers if left unhampered can, and sometimes do, exercise a vast influence over the students. But unfortunately their hands are tied, their freedom of action is taken away. They are unable to instruct their pupils in the subjects which they consider are best suited to develop their minds and their morals, nor are they at liberty to devote to physical exercises such a portion of time as may seem desirable to them. The baneful influence of the University is over them. Students who join a particular college do not consider the excellence of the intellectual and moral training received there, but look upon it as a machine which will impart to them that amount of knowledge which will enable them to pass the various examinations. Even missionary colleges fulfil no better functions. An infinitesimal portion of the day's time is perhaps devoted to Scripture reading, but the rest is all "cram," "cram," and nothing but "cram," so as to enable the student to obtain his degree. Thus it happens that the University itself exercises no influence whatever on the youths who are being launched out into the world by hundreds every year, and, furthermore, prevents the colleges which come directly into contact with them from influencing these men as they might.

The blame lies at the door of the Universities. They have adopted a system of education which has few redeeming features in it, and which differs radically from the system of such Universities as Oxford and Cambridge. At these English Universities a student has to pass a preliminary examination in certain specified subjects which guarantee that, up to a certain standard, he has received a general education, which is to serve as a basis for his future studies. In India, the entrance examination may be said to correspond with the preliminary or previous examination. But when we proceed further the difference is marked. At the English Universities the student in his further course is allowed to select a particular branch of learning, and he devotes his energy specially to it. But the Universities in India have made it obligatory on every candidate for a degree to undergo an examination in a multiplicity of subjects which have no connexion with each other. For the ordinary B.A. degree a candidate must not only pass an examination in English literature but must also learn a second language (it may be either Persian, or Sanscrit, or Latin, or Greek), for which he has no taste. And where is the necessity for his cramming into his head a thick volume of history, or puzzling his brains with higher mathematics, when he would much rather devote his attention to philosophy and logic? Or if he desires to read law or medicine, he finds that he is unable to do so unless, after passing the entrance examination, he spends at least four years upon subjects which are useless to him. The absurdity of the system is still more striking when we take into consideration the fact that after a student has passed the entrance examination he is required to take a further course of two years, and to pass another examination called the First Examination in Arts, the subjects being English, literature, a second language, ordinary mathematics, history or higher mathematics, logic or sciences. This is a comprehensive range of subjects. But even then the University will not leave the unfortunate youth alone. He may say: "I now wish to devote myself exclusively to one branch of learning, and to take my degree in it. I have a taste for English literature, or for philosophy, or for history, or for mathematics. Let me apply all my energy to the acquirement of the knowledge relating to one special subject." The University says, "No, you must have another 'cram,' you must again take up half-a-dozen subjects, in which, if you obtain a certain proportion of marks, you will obtain a degree, and if you have the inclination, and time, and energy, to make a special study of any one of these subjects, and can obtain 50 per cent. of marks, you will be supposed to have passed in honours in that subject." The poor student proceeds. He knows that he could easily secure the requisite number of marks for honours in the subject of his choice, but he must try to "cram" his head with a variety of subjects, and if he cannot do it his further progress is absolutely arrested.

What is the net result of this system of education? A certain number of youths are either mentally or physically incapacitated from prosecuting their studies to the end, though some of them had given promise of being brilliant scholars in special subjects. These, of course, drop out of the running. The rest proceed and obtain a degree from the University. Is this degree a guarantee that the graduates are really educated men? Unfortunately, experience shows it to be otherwise. The degree is too often merely an indication that its owner has shown an aptitude for "cramming" into his head a certain number of facts and figures which have enabled him to secure a certain proportion of marks. A man who has a highly retentive memory is often successful, but he does not necessarily possess the most cultivated mind. Once the degree is obtained the graduate shows himself in his true colours. Here we come to the most lamentable fact of all. The majority of graduates, once they have obtained their degree, throw aside their books. They cultivated learning, not for love of it, but for the particular end they had in view. Once that end is attained, why should they worry themselves any more about books? The consequence is that in the course of two or three years they forget what they had learnt. They are launched upon the world with a degree, certainly, and with a superficial knowledge of a variety of subjects, but this knowledge is a diminishing quantity every day. Blame may be laid at the door of the graduates who adopt a line of conduct utterly

opposed to that pursued by really educated men, but the system of education must be intrinsically bad which, instead of encouraging a love of learning, infuses into the young mind an antipathy to it. Learning has been to most of these men like some nauseous medicine which has been poured down their throats in increasing doses. Once free from the necessity of taking it, no wonder they avoid it in the future.

In the course of a forty years' existence the Indian universities have not succeeded in producing any great specialist, and with the continuance of the present system the chances are very much against their ever being able to produce one. Within the last few months Mr. J. C. Bose, Professor of the Presidency College, has, it is true, earned a high reputation for his scientific discoveries. But he is a graduate of Cambridge University, where he received special training in science. Possibly if his educational career had been guided by one of the Indian universities, India would not even have produced one man whose original researches were destined to win the acknowledgment of scientific Europe.

THE HISTORY OF THE TRANSVAAL.

MR. J. DACOSTA writes: "The Transvaal affair having attracted much interest in India, I am led to believe that Mr. Garrett Fisher's 'Brief History of the Transvaal,' just published by Messrs. Chapman and Hall, will interest your Indian readers, as it throws light on the origin of the crisis through which that country has just passed, and may, among the conflicting views published on the subject, materially aid to prevent misconceptions. I venture, therefore, to send herewith a short summary of the book."

Appended is Mr. Dacosta's summary:

The author narrates how the Dutch landed in Table Bay in 1595, settled there as the Netherlands East India Company in 1602, were joined by Huguenots in 1685, and how, after two centuries, their lands were occupied by the English in 1795, when the great French revolution prevented the Dutch colonists receiving the support of their countrymen at home. In 1835, when the slaves were emancipated, the Dutch colonists (commonly known as "Boers," a word meaning "Farmers") were promised full compensation for the loss of their slaves; but the promise was not fulfilled and this, together with other wrongs suffered at the hands of the British Government, induced the Boers to emigrate into Natal which was then held by the Zulus. These warlike savages attacked and slew a great many of the Dutch emigrants; but the latter succeeded ultimately in establishing their Republic of Natalia and in breaking the power of the Zulus. Thereupon, English troops attacked the Republic and took possession of its territory on the ground that the Boers were British subjects, although the allegation was flatly denied by the Boers themselves. Large numbers of the latter, therefore, abandoned their farms, and, crossing the Orange river, founded in 1845 the village of Lydenburg. Those who had remained in Natal complained of great injustice suffered at the hands of the English officials, and Jacobus Pretorius, addressing the Cape Government on their behalf, offered to explain their grievances; but Sir Henry Pottinger, the Governor, refused to see him, and Pretorius then headed the final emigration from Natal.

In 1845 the Boers founded the South African Republic in the country between the Orange and Vaal rivers; when the English immediately proclaimed the Queen's sovereignty over that tract on the ground on which they had previously claimed the Boer territory in Natal. The tract was then invaded by English troops and officials; but Pretorius, at the head of a body of Boers, captured Bloemfontein and expelled the British resident. General Sir Harry Smith (surnamed the hero of Aliwal and Subraon), who was then Governor of Cape Colony, offered £1,000 for the apprehension of Pretorius; and, heading an English force, dispersed the Boers at Boomplatz, after a skirmish which he described as the most severe he had ever witnessed. Meanwhile the English Government offered £2,000 for Pretorius's head; his outlawry, however, was reversed in 1851 and he was invited to a conference to negotiate for the independence of the South African Republic. The Sand River Convention was the result: it conceded to the Boers the right to manage their affairs according to their own laws, and without British interference; and it guaranteed that no encroachment should be made by the British Government north of the river Vaal.

In 1853 Jacobus Pretorius died, and was succeeded by his son, Marthenus Pretorius, who resigned in 1872, T. F. Burger being elected President of the Republic. The town of Pretoria, named in honour of the deceased President, was founded in 1885.

Meanwhile neighbouring native tribes manifested hostility to the Boers, the Zulus from the South, the Amaswazis from the North, and Bechuana Chiefs from the West, while the Bapedi, led by Sekukuni, actually encroached on the Boer territory in 1876. The Volksraad sent a Commando to punish them, and Sekukuni was reduced to sue for peace.

The English Government then intimated that they would not consent to the South African Republic engaging in foreign military operations, and on the Republic curtly replying that they had a right to their territory, the Government sent troops for the annexation of the country, promising at the same time that, if the Boers submitted, they should have complete self-government and the maintenance of their laws. These promises, however, were not fulfilled, and the English occupation was followed by the imposition of taxes, the appointment of a packed State Council and a censorship of the Press. For two and a-half years every successive administrator made the same promises and failed to keep them. Moreover, an Executive Council and a Legislative Assembly entirely nominated by the English Government led once more to the cry for independence. A Boer deputation visited England to protest against the invasion of their country, and had several interviews with Lord Carnarvon, without, however, obtaining any distinct and direct answer. A monster petition was then sent to England, and the new Colonial Secre-

tary, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, replied that in no circumstance would the Transvaal be given up, and that if the delegates would go home and wait, all their wrongs would be put right in the Government's good time. The delegates replied that, once for all, no reform short of complete independence would now content the Boers.

On their return Sir Bartle Frere repeated the promises of self-government in local affairs; but he was soon afterwards superseded by Sir Garnet Wolseley who, with Colonel Lanyon, subjected the Transvaal to military rule, and treated it as a conquered country. The Boers—exasperated at the conduct of their military governors with their "tall talk," declaring that "so long as the sun shone, England would rule the Transvaal," and their threat to "hang rebels who grumbled"—held in December, 1879, a meeting presided over by Pretorius, junior, at which it was declared that the people of the South African Republic had never been British subjects, and were determined not to be. The High Commissioner had Mr. Pretorius and his Secretary put in jail, and the Boers commenced to lay in supplies of powder and lead.

The Beaconsfield Ministry was drawing to a close. The affairs of the Transvaal were referred to in the Queen's Speech; and Lord Hartington, speaking on the address, declared that the annexation of the Transvaal had been sanctioned by the House under wrong impressions and incorrect information.

"If it be proved," he added, "that it is for the advantage of that district and for the peace of the whole community of South Africa that the Transvaal should continue to be governed by us, let it be so. But if, on the other hand, we find that it will be more advantageous and more honourable to restore the former government of that country, then I say that no false notion of dignity ought to stand in the way."

About the same time—on the 30th March, 1880—Mr. Gladstone said at Peebles that Lord Beaconsfield's acquisition of the Transvaal was worthless, and added:

"And I say that if it were as valuable as it is valueless, I would repudiate it, because it has been obtained by means dishonourable to our country."

But when he was, some weeks later, returned to power by a great majority, he said that,

"it was impossible to consider the matter as if it were presented for the first time, and that his judgment was that the Queen could not be advised to relinquish her sovereignty over the Transvaal."

The Government and the English settlers, who were rapidly increasing in number, were confident that the Boers would limit themselves to protests, and the warnings of Messrs. Kruger, Joubert, and Pretorius fell upon deaf ears. Col. Lanyon was instructed to enforce the full payment of taxes, and he claimed in addition all arrears from the time of Mr. Burger, and in many instances, more than was owing. The badgered Boers told the magistrates: "You will drive us to desperation." A man named Bezuidenhout was summoned in November, 1880, to pay a tax of £27 5s. which was double what he really owed; and he pleaded his readiness to pay what was due; but the plea was rejected and his waggon was attached. On the day fixed for the sale a number of Boers rescued the waggon; and Col. Lanyon having sent a military force to arrest the ringleaders, armed Boers defended them.

Early the next month the Boers held meetings at Paarde Kraal at which the Volksraad was restored and Kruger, Joubert, and Pretorious were appointed to administer the provisional Government until independence should be assured by arms. They wrote a letter to Sir Owen Lanyon saying:

"We solemnly declare that we have no desire to shed blood. It lies in your hands to force us to appeal to arms in self-defence. Should it come so far, we shall defend ourselves with the knowledge that we are fighting for the honour of her Majesty the Queen; for we fight for the sanctity of the treaties sworn to by her but broken by her officers."

The proclamation which accompanied this letter repeated that the Boers had never been subjects of her Majesty and never would be. Colonel Lanyon immediately telegraphed for more troops, each man to carry 70 to 100 rounds of ammunition. On the 16th December a party of Boers insulted the English garrison at Potchefstroom, and the force sent to drive them off was fired upon, besieged and cut off from communication with Pretoria and elswhere. Then speedily followed the worst blow that befell English arms since the day of Islandlwana. A detachment of the 94th regiment ordered up from Middleburg was attacked at Bronkhurst Spruit on the 19th, and in less than ten minutes half the force was *hors de combat* and the rest surrendered. Colonel Lanyon was shut in Pretoria. Sir George Colley, who marched at the head of 1,400 men, met the Boers at Laing's Nek, and delivered an attack which failed in consequence of the terribly accurate fire of the defenders. The English drew off with a heavy loss, and tried the next day to work round the Ingogo plateau; but the superior marksmanship of the Boers compelled them to steal back under cover of night, leaving their wounded at the mercy of the enemy.

Sir Evelyn Wood then brought up reinforcements, and a third method of attack was tried. Half the force marched in the night to the top of the Majuba Hill with a view to render the position of the Boers untenable. At dawn, however, when the Boers saw the red-coats 2,000 feet above them, some began to climb the precipitous face of the Majuba, while others kept up a long range fire at everything that showed over the brow of the hill. Finally the Boers reached the hollow crown of the Majuba, and engaged the English at a distance of 40 yards, when the English troops wavered, broke, and in a minute were running for life down the side of the mountain. General Colley was down with a bullet in his brain. The English then came to terms and, in an armistice concluded on March 21, 1881, they agreed to evacuate the Transvaal and to acknowledge its independence, reserving a right of sovereignty that should be settled on terms satisfactory to the Boers. The Pretoria Convention signed on August 3, 1881, was, however replaced by the Convention of London ratified in August, 1884. The claim of suzerainty was not maintained; but a right was reserved for the British Government to disapprove within six months any treaty which the South African Republic might conclude with a foreign nation or a native tribe and which the British Government considered as

contrary to the interests of her Majesty's possessions in South Africa.

Gold was discovered on the Kaap and Witwatersrand in 1885. Johannesburg was founded in December, 1886. The population of the Transvaal was estimated in December, 1894, by Sir Jacobus de Wet, the English agent in Pretoria, at 71,000 Boers, 63,000 British subjects, and 16,000 other aliens.

The Executive of the Transvaal Government consists of a President elected by the Burghers for five years, with a Council composed of the State Secretary, the Commandant General and the Secretary, and of three non-official members elected by the Volksraad. The legislative authority is in the hands of the popularly elected Volksraad. Burghers may vote in the election of the Volksraad and sit in it. Foreigners, thirty years of age, may become naturalised citizens, after four years of residence, by taking the oath of allegiance, provided that they are members of a Protestant Church.

INDIAN IDEALS.[1]

Was it not Professor Max Müller who once applied to religions the saying that "he who only knows his own language knows none"? Certainly there is an important sense in which it is true of religions. He who knows only his own religion may have a rule of conduct, a faith to live and die by, but he can give no reason for the faith that is in him, is in no position to form a sound intellectual judgment on his creed. And if even for the refining and purifying, the placing on a sounder foundation, of a man's own belief, the study of religions is desirable, it becomes still more desirable if he wants to understand men and nations brought up under the influence of other creeds. More than half the uncharitable judgments of the world, it has been finely said, are due to a deficiency of imagination. Yet, of those who are brought into contact with other races, how few take the necessary steps for the cultivation of a defective imagination by the patient study of an alien religion, by an honest endeavour to place themselves at the point of view of its adherents. If missionaries, for instance, were always to do this, there would have been no need for Mr. Sturdy's indignant protest on the misuse of a debased interpretation of the allegory of Krisna and the shepherdesses as a weapon of hostile criticism against Hindu religions.

"We may safely assert that none of these have read the original, but merely sought some means to destroy other people's religion in order to advocate their own. Time might better be employed in pointing out the original intention of the allegory, by which they would elevate both themselves and the people with whom they come in contact. By taking the other attitude they confirm the pariah in his ignorance, stimulate his resentment, and stand as the enemies of Krisna the Divine. Love is one, whether it be called that of Christ, Krisna, or any other individualised expression of Truth. . . . . The love of Krisna is deep in the Hindu heart, and cannot be thus slighted with impunity. Yet under all these irritations the Hindu has yet to be found who would retort by any insult or criticism of the founder of Christianity. To the Hindu such criticism of the pure and noble of any race or age is a dreadful crime, involving far-reaching retributive effects. It is a pity we do not think the same." (P. 32-3).

No Christian could study "Nârada Sûtra" without gaining a new sympathy, a new and strange sense of kinship, with those who through many generations have regarded these maxims as divine. "Love is surrendering all actions to God, and feeling the greatest misery in forgetting God" (§ 19). "Being praised, God manifests himself soon and makes himself felt by his worshippers" (§ 80). "In all times (past, present, and future) Love is the greatest thing" (§ 81). The voices that the Indian has heard in the East are mysteriously like those that have spoken to the Western peoples. It may be that the Christian reader will even be tempted to lay too much stress on the likeness; for, though Mr. Sturdy speaks of the opposition that is excited by doctrines new and strange, there is a subtle fascination for many minds in these oracles from a distant shrine, the fascination of a familiar tone heard by the traveller in a far country.

Mr. Sturdy's object in translating "Nârada Sûtra" is to win the attention of English readers for the Indian doctrine of *Bhakti Yoga*, "Salvation by Love and Devotion." We gather that he is in strong sympathy with Swâmi Vivekânanda, the accomplished Yogi who is at present lecturing in England on Indian metaphysics, and who claims to teach a philosophy that can serve as a basis to any religious system. "I direct my attention," the Swâmi is quoted as saying, "to the individual, to teach him that he himself is divine, and I call upon men to make themselves conscious of this divinity within"; and again, "I teach only the Self, hidden in the heart of every individual, and common to all. A handful of strong men knowing that Self and living in its light would revolutionise the world, even to-day, as has been the case by single strong men before, each in his day." One cannot but hope that this little series will reach a wider circle of students than has been touched by the "Sacred Books of the East," or by Professor Max Müller's Hibbert Lectures of 1878, and penetrate more deeply, if less widely, than Sir Edwin Arnold's "Light of Asia." Perhaps in future volumes of the series a little more help in the way of a historical introduction might be given to the ignorant but interested Western reader. It is not, however, for the translation alone that we owe something to Mr. Sturdy. It would be ungrateful to pass over in silence the extreme beauty of parts of his commentary. Here is one fine saying: "He who loves equally everywhere need seek no asceticism: it will seek him as long as he has a coin to spend, a loaf to divide or a coat to give" (p. 27). And here is another: "No religious system pretends to define Deity; it can at the best strive with other systems to suspend some intellectual or emotional veil through which, in shining, the light may take form" (p. 44). A still nobler passage, on the "lonely places" in the depths of the heart (p. 42), is too long to quote. The saying (p. 8), "The aspiration to realisation hardly enters the minds of modern Western people," should give food for reflec-

[1] "Nârada Sûtra: An Inquiry into Love." Translated from the Sanskrit, with an independent Commentary. By E. T. Sturdy. "Indian Ideals," No. I. (London: Longmans, Green and Co.)

tion to sincere believers in Christianity. More doubtful is the assertion (p. 7) that "the great possibility of realisation was, to a great extent, destroyed for Christianity with the decay of the monastic system." Realisation in the world, rather than realisation outside of it, was surely the ideal of Christ and his apostles.

UNIVERSITY REFORM IN INDIA.

Dr. W. H. Wilson contributes to a recent issue of the *Madras Review* an important article on University Reform. Attempts are being made by a small but resolute section of the Senate of Madras University to introduce very necessary reforms in the administration of University affairs. "There are," writes Dr. Wilson, "three points on which these gentlemen particularly insist; and the first of these is the necessity of Fellows, if they are to discharge the duties of their office, being kept informed on all matters concerning the University. This object they propose to attain by printing and distributing to the Fellows of the University the minutes of all meetings of the Senate, the Faculties, and the Syndicate, as is done in the Universities of Calcutta and Allahabad. The second is to make the Syndicate a more representative body than it is at present, and better fitted to discharge the important duties entrusted to it. The attainment of this object, no doubt, presents great difficulties, and to secure it fully many deep-seated and radical changes will be necessary. The only change now proposed consists in merely increasing the strength of the Syndicate from eight elected members to eleven, and so bringing it up to the level of the corresponding bodies in Calcutta and Bombay. It is, perhaps, scarcely to be expected that any great improvement will result from this change, but it will, it is hoped, have the effect of making further reforms easier in the future. The last of the three reforms is one of great importance in the practical administration of University affairs. It is the proposal to define the relations between the Senate and the Syndicate, and to require the latter body to recognise its responsibility to the former. To say that the relations between the two bodies are at present ill-defined is to understate the case; they are simply not defined at all: the result being that disputes are constantly arising, and the right of the Syndicate to exercise specific powers constantly being challenged."

Dr. Wilson next gives a sketch of the history and relations to one another of the three older Indian Universities, situated in the Presidency towns of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, and of all three to their English prototype, the University of London. It is well known that these three institutions were all founded in the same year, under precisely similar Acts of Incorporation, and were modelled on the lines of London University. Dr. Wilson shews clearly that while London University has adapted itself to the requirements of the age, the Indian Universities stand grievously in need of reform. His proposals for them may be summarised thus:—

1. The incorporation of the graduates into a body having a definite legal status in the University.
2. The institution of a number of Standing Committees of the Senate for specified purposes.
3. The enlargement of the syndicate and alterations in the manner of electing it.
4. The publication of minutes of the proceedings of Senate, Syndicate, and Faculties.
5. The introduction of proxy-voting at elections.
6. The abolition of the rule requiring members of the Syndicate to reside in Madras, and its corollary, the introduction of a rule making retention of office conditional upon attendance at a certain proportion of meetings.
7. The increase of the number of statutory meetings of the Senate (exclusive of the Convocation for conferring degrees) from one to three or four; the said meetings to be held preferably on Saturdays, in order that the largest possible number of Fellows may be enabled to attend.

"These proposals, it will be noticed, all have reference to the government and administration of the University, for the previously stated reason, that these reforms must precede all others. The hands of the Syndicate are already more than full in carrying on the current business of the University, and it has not the time, even had it the inclination, to engage in projects for reform in the various directions in which it is necessary. And for a private member of the Senate, or even a considerable number of such members, to attempt what the Syndicate disapproves of, (and, generally speaking, it disapproves of every proposal which does not emanate from itself) is to court failure.

"Space forbids my entering on the present occasion upon the consideration of the many other reforms of the necessity for which an intimate acquaintance with the University for over twenty years has convinced me, and I shall therefore confine myself to the mere mention of two which are specially pressing. One of these is measures for securing a much greater degree of accuracy and efficiency in valuing examination papers, particularly at the lower examinations, than exists at present. It is no exaggeration to say that, under the present system, or want of it, it is a toss up whether a large percentage of the candidates for matriculation fail or whether they pass. Another is the proper recognition of science as a branch of study and its complete separation at a certain stage from linguistic studies. Every attempt to combine such different subjects in any course of moderate length has failed and must always fail, and the chief result of the Madras University's efforts in this direction is the wholesale manufacture of graduates who know little English and less science."

Presiding over a meeting of the East India Association, held at Westminster Town-hall on June 23rd, Sir Lepel Griffen said that "on the one question which was now before the English and Indian world—namely, the payment by India or by England of the troops employed in the Sudan—he thought no person who was a true friend of India and who wished well to the British Government at home could possibly be silent. If the honour of England and the English people were to be considered the question could only be decided in one way. So long as Indian troops were employed in Africa on work which was entirely outside those duties which were laid down in the India Act for the legitimate employment of Indian troops out of Indian revenues, they should be paid the whole of their ordinary pay and the whole of the extraordinary expenses, and not one rupee should be charged to the revenues of India. The matter was one of very great importance, and the honour of England was distinctly involved."

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JULY, 1896.

THE DETECTIVE AS JUDGE.

WE understand that an important Memorial will shortly be presented to the Secretary of State for India, praying for the separation of judicial and executive functions in the territories whose welfare he is appointed to protect. The wonder to English minds must be not that this separation is asked for, but that the union of functions so essentially incompatible should ever have been made. It is, no doubt, true that the Homeric king was priest and lawgiver as well as leader in war. But Lord George Hamilton will hardly contend that British rule in India is supposed to conform to the Homeric type. The history of the question, which repeated exposition has long since made familiar throughout India, shows that, in theory at any rate, the Government of India has on many occasions admitted the unreasonableness, and therefore the peril, of uniting in one and the same officer the functions and duties of detective and magistrate, public prosecutor and criminal judge, revenue collector and revenue judge in appeal. Indeed, the Government of India, that we may do it justice, has gone further than the academic recognition of an abstract truth. A century ago—in 1793—actual steps were taken in the time of Lord Cornwallis to terminate the travesty of justice by which a revenue officer in India adjudicated on appeals from his own assessments. The Government then observed, in a commendable platitude, that it, "must divest itself of "the power of infringing in its executive capacity "the rights and privileges which, as exercising the "legislative authority, it has conferred on the "landholders," or, in other words, that "the "revenue officers must be deprived of their judicial "powers." In the sixty years which elapsed between that period and the Indian Mutiny it is not difficult to trace a growing inclination on the part of high officials to terminate the union of functions which ought always to have been distinguished. But it would seem that the Mutiny set back the hands of the clock. It is, indeed, possible to cite many authoritative expressions of opinion since 1859—notably the report of the Police Commission, and the speeches on the Police Bill, in 1860—in favour of separation. But the Government of India became stiff-necked. A reform which was approved in principle was delayed in practice. More than that, executive interference with the judiciary began to grow, and within recent years, as Sir Richard Garth and Mr. J. Dacosta have so clearly shown, this interference has developed to an intolerable extent. The Courts and the executive have come into scarcely veiled conflict, revenue officers have been granted special privileges and exemptions, and the right of District Magistrates to tamper with the judicial independence of subordinate magistrates has been openly stated and recommended in the highest executive quarters. This is a deplorable state of things, which the separation of judicial from executive duties cannot, of course, wholly remedy. But it will be a long step in the right direction, and it ought to be taken without further delay.

The members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee are themselves well qualified to lay before the Secretary of State some account of the evils which are inseparable from the present system, and to request the only possible remedy. A man need not be a retired Anglo-Indian, nor a lawyer, in order to discern the unfitness of a detective to act as a judge. But the Indian Parliamentary Committee may nevertheless strengthen its hands by securing the co-operation of some of the eminent legal authorities who, in our columns and elsewhere, have borne testimony to the need of reform. Men like Sir Richard Garth, who was Chief Justice of Bengal, Lord Hobhouse, who was Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council from 1872 to 1877, and Sir J. Budd Phear, who was Chief Justice of Ceylon, will lend to the representations of the Indian Parliamentary Committee a weight that the India Office will not easily resist. The burden of the present grievance consists in the anomalous position of Collector-Magistrates. These complacent pluralists are at once, as Sir W. W. Hunter says, both fiscal officers, charged with the collection of the revenue from the land and other sources, and revenue and criminal judges of first instance and in appeal. They have besides a formidable array of miscellaneous duties, which include, together with such trifles as the superintendence of education and sanitation, the

control and direction of the police. Sir J. P. Grant in 1857 pointed out, as Sir Frederick Halliday had done before, and as Sir Barnes Peacock and Sir Bartle Frere did afterwards, the monstrous absurdity of supposing that any officer, after putting his wits to the utmost stretch in order to beat his adversary in the game of detection, could then sit down to try as a dispassionate judge, upon the evidence given in court, the question whether he or his adversary had won the game. Sir J. P. Grant added that one or two cases of this sort would excite as much indignation as would save him the necessity of argument *a priori* against the combination theory. The cases have occurred, the indignation has been excited, but the combination system is permitted to remain. There are two ways in which a District Magistrate may now be responsible for a judicial scandal. He may himself try a criminal case in which he has directed the operations of the police, or received information from them. Or he may assign the case to a subordinate magistrate within his control and, by means of private communications which are known colloquially as "demi-official chits," inform his subordinate how he expects the case to end. This second method is, it seems to us, rather worse than the first. The mischief of the present system is not merely that it is responsible for palpable miscarriages of justice, but that it affords opportunities for suspicion and recrimination where substantial justice is done. The Maimansingh case, which in May, 1893, gave rise to an important debate on the whole question in the House of Lords, is but a recent and conspicuous example to which only too frequent parallels can be found. Mr. Manomohan Ghose, whose exertions to secure the separation of the two sets of functions are beyond all praise, has compiled an authentic catalogue of cases which are enough to make an Englishman's hair stand on end in mingled astonishment and indignation.

It is, of course, upon the proved fact that the combination of judicial and executive duties in the same officer has frequently led to grave scandals that the advocates of separation chiefly rely. A District Magistrate would need to be more, or less, than human in order to discharge adequately his varied and incompatible functions. As an executive officer he is bound to keep his ears open to reports which he may turn to account in the interests of his District. Needless to say, such a habit is diametrically opposed to the judicial rigour which excludes information that is not given in court in accordance with the rules of evidence. Nor would it be easy to over-estimate the mischief to which, under the present system, the lack of professional training and knowledge in the judicial officer gives rise. Mr. Gladstone once said that a man of forty could no more be made into a member of Parliament than a woman of forty could be made into a ballet-girl. The proper mode of taking evidence, and of ascertaining fact by the *viva voce* examination and cross-examination of witnesses, is not, to put it gently, an accomplishment which comes to every man by nature. It can be acquired only by careful study and long practice. It is, indeed, a business in itself, and it is ridiculous to suppose that a man whose aim, ambition, and principal work lie in the executive department can also discharge, even with the most moderate success, the special and exacting duties of a judicial office. It is, we repeat, difficult to perceive upon what grounds sensible and fair-minded men can defend the existing system. Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross, who have both been Secretaries of State for India, and, as Lord George Hamilton would probably be the first to admit, know a good deal more about India than he does, make no pretence of defending the existing system. They merely allege that, in the present state of Indian finance, the cost of reform is prohibitive. But that allegation, since it was made, has been fully met and disposed of in our columns by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, Commissioner of the Orissa Division, who, speaking with expert knowledge of the offices concerned, declared and, as we think, satisfactorily showed that the cost of separation would be nothing at all. We await with some interest Lord G. Hamilton's reply to the Memorial. Having retained Chitral, will he plead the financial difficulty? Or will he have the courage openly to adduce the "prestige" argument, which simply means that District Magistrates of a certain type are anxious to remain as formidable, and as much like an ancient Oriental despot, as possible without the Oriental despot's knowledge of his people? In any case the Secretary of State will find it hard to refuse a request that the Government of India may be instructed to report upon the subject.

A COMPLACENT PHILOSOPHER.[1]

It has been said, not without truth, that the hope of the present age is bound up with its middle-aged men, whose cheery view of life is in marked contrast with the gloomy pessimism of the youth of the period. Had the writer of a very able article on this topic in the now extinct *Universal Review* been acquainted with the papers from Sir Edwin Arnold's pen published in book form under the title of "East and West," he would no doubt have referred to them for illustrations of his theory. The range of the articles now collected for the first time is not less wide than the title claims. They cover many lands from Birmingham to Tokio, and various topics, from Buddhism to limpets. But a common thread appears in the most important of the papers, in the shape of a somewhat veiled exposition of a new creed, which is darkly hinted at in the address on "Aspects of Life" delivered to a Birmingham audience three years ago, and vaguely outlined in "Astronomy and Religion," "Love the Preserver," and other articles. Examined critically, this "Religio Magistri," if, following a current fashion, we may label it as the distinctive property of its creator, will be found to consist of fragments of religions, old and new, set in a background of general cheerfulness and complacency. Fragments of Christianity, large blocks of Buddhism, a trace here and there of Aristotelian, Platonic, and even Neo-Kantian

[1] "East and West." Being papers reprinted from the *Daily Telegraph* and other sources, by Sir Edwin Arnold. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1896. Price, 18s.

doctrines, all find a place in the general mosaic, bound together by a cement of placid optimism. It is the creed, if creed it can be called, for opinion and sentiment supply the place of belief, of a man brought up in Christianity, and trained in Oxford philosophical teaching, whose imagination has been stimulated by the teeming life of the East, and whose mind has been quick to note the curious anticipation in Buddhist theories of some of the doctrines of Greek philosophy, and even of the later developments of the Darwinian theory. Sir Edwin Arnold's genius tends to synthesis rather than analysis, and he is less concerned to observe the incongruities of life and its apparently inextricable confusion and contradiction than to trace a principle of harmony underlying the discord, and controlling in a beneficent manner the evolution of the race. So he would appear to connect as different aspects of the same truth doctrines so widely divergent in point of time and origin as Darwinism, the Buddhist doctrine of continuity of life, and the Lucretian and Neo-Kantian doctrine of the universal intelligence. In his defence of the cosmic process he joins issue with Professor Huxley, who in his famous Romanes lecture at Oxford four years ago, maintained that "the ethical progress of society depends not on "imitating the cosmic process, but on combating it." On this Sir Edwin Arnold remarks that, "so luminous "a mind certainly overlooked the fact that the ethical "faculty and the ethical ideal, which he contrasted "with the course of nature, have likewise come by "evolution, forth from the cosmic process." But this is exactly the point at issue between evolution and its opponents, who stoutly deny the applicability of the doctrine to ethical faculties and relations, however great its probability as a theory of physical existence.

From another point of view the author's creed is the creed of a man who has lived a full life, and whose work has been crowned with success, and has gained the meed of public and official recognition which so much good work must perforce miss. "I "have found life" he says, "in the highest degree "charming and interesting, and this notwithstand-"ing an ample share of what are styled — some-"times I think a little too querulously—its pains "and sorrows. I come back glad to have lived, "well satisfied with my share in the world." Here is the explanation of the optimism that forms the basis of Sir Edwin Arnold's teaching. Thus it is that after a long residence in India he is enabled to ask light-heartedly, "As to the 'sin and misery' "business, however, is it not now-a-days absurdly "exaggerated"? to allude to "the universal wil-"lingness to live," and to support his contentions by numerous quotations from "The Light of Asia." "Willingness to live" is after all only our old friend the instinct of self-preservation masquerading in a new dress, and what can be the value of an argument based on a universal instinct? In the essay entitled "Love the Preserver" it is suggested that the maternal instinct has its origin in "a far-off "real personal interest in lives beyond the mother's "life," and emphasis is laid on the strength of an interest which can overcome the self-preservative instinct. Following this example we cannot be wrong in laying a corresponding stress on the not unfrequent willingness to die, illustrated as it is by the daily records of self-destruction. With Sir Edwin Arnold's views in the main we willingly concur. Pessimism is an unsatisfactory creed, and, as he says, "from the lowest point of view hope is "very cheap and gladness acts as a sovereign "medicine." But there is a middle course between pessimism and the wilful disregard of the darker side of things. Satisfaction with the average conditions of life is easy when one is on the right side of the average, but no amount of argument deduced from statistics can console the unfortunate individual on the wrong side of the middle line. Side by side with a hopeful view of the destiny of mankind there is room for the "divine discontent" that seldom invades the official mind, and Sir Edwin Arnold inclines to the official view. "How beneficent our "government of India is, was well shown in those "dark days of the famine." True; but nothing is so potent to efface the memory of great benefits as a series of petty injustices, of which the starvation of the famine fund may justly be reckoned one. "It "is before all things necessary that the British "people should comprehend the Imperial importance "of India, and be very resolute amid all political "changes not to suffer for one moment that the strong "hand of the Queen's Viceroy at Calcutta shall be "weakened by ignorant theorists, and the breathless "benevolence of globe-trotting politicians," nor, we might add, by the short-sighted optimism and nescience of officials at the India Office.

From a literary point of view the book merits little but praise. Its contents reach a much higher standard of excellence than one is accustomed to associate with special articles in journals or magazines. Inconclusive and unscientific as are the speculations of the author in the realm of religion and philosophy they are none the less, but rather on that account more, interesting and readable. His publishers, too, have spared no pains to prepossess the reader in his favour. Type, plates, paper, and binding leave nothing to be desired. Moreover, the volume possesses in a high degree that quality of handiness which is so dear to the heart of the book-lover, a quality independent of mere weight or size, and the outcome of a due proportion between shape, size, and weight. But apart from such meretricious aids to charm, the experiences of a traveller like Sir Edwin Arnold could hardly fail to be attractive if well told. And Sir Edwin Arnold tells a tale well, even when he himself is the central figure. He relates many charming little anecdotes in a delightful manner, and adorns nearly everything he touches. It is doubtful, however, whether the expansion of Herodotus's tale about the treasure house of Rhampsinitus is any improvement upon the original. The father of history is himself the prince of *raconteurs*, and to try to amend his tales at any rate is an undertaking from which no man can expect to emerge successful. Much more valuable are the records of personal experience, such as the papers entitled "The "Two Bridges," and "An Engine of Fate," or the discursive and appreciative treatment of Oriental topics like "The Indian Woods" and "The Sword of "Japan." Especially noteworthy, clothing with flesh

and blood the dry bones of statistics in the "Official "Abstract" under the head of "Wild Beasts," is the series of papers on "Jungle Kingdoms," wherein are reproduced the interesting features of that perpetual warfare between man and beast which the statistics indicate. One of these papers is marred by what, perhaps, may be regarded, without hypercriticism, as an error of taste. Speaking of an attempt to tame a couple of hyaena cubs the author says: "Both came to a melancholy and "violent end, having developed with their molar teeth "a taste for native babies." It is ill jesting where another's suffering is involved, especially where there is an inequality in station and power. Together with this lack of sympathy which, from time to time, strikes a jarring note, Sir Edwin Arnold appears to have imbibed some other prejudices of the governing clique during his residence in India. For when in jest Lord Dufferin, on bidding him farewell, asked what he could do for him "even unto the half of his kingdom," he could think of no worthier boon for the people amongst whom he had lived and worked than a railway to Kandahar.

THE FINANCIAL PERIL.[1]

THIS unpretending pamphlet of 32 pages is worthy of more attention at the present moment than many a volume ten or twenty times its size. It professes to be, and it is, a dispassionate survey of the position of Indian finance, and it "reveals a state of things almost bordering on the desperate."

A DESPERATE SITUATION.

What Professor Murison indicated by suggestion in his article on the Indian Budget in our last month's issue is expressed by the author in frank terms:

> "Such is the situation—desperate and full of peril—with which we have to grapple. Revenue and expenditure, no doubt, balance each other, and according to European tests, the financial equilibrium so established is a decisive proof of the soundness of the system—a view of the position which Lord George Hamilton evidently holds. But such are the conditions of Government and administration in this country that in this very balanced position of the national finances—on which the Secretary of State congratulates us—there lurks *grave danger* to which we ought no longer to shut our eyes."

The full and searching analysis of the accounts, which forms the substance of the pamphlet, abundantly justifies the author's conclusions, and corroborates the contentions that have been steadily pressed in these pages.

THE COST OF TERRITORIAL EXTENSION.

Thus, after a review of the military expeditions of the last dozen years, with their enormous expansion of territorial liabilities, the author asks:

> "Was all such territorial extension at all necessary for the purpose? Was it necessary to advance the bounds of the Empire so far into the wilds and deserts of Mid-Asia and East Africa? Was it not possible to avoid so large an extension of administrative and diplomatic liabilities, consistently with the obligations of national safety? . . . . The new policy and its results, so far as may be judged from present indications, leave the diplomatic and military situation, we fear, distinctly worse and weaker than it was twelve years ago. But our present concern is only with the financial aspects of these so-called 'defensive' measures of the past twelve years, and we have here only to take note of the fact that they have entailed on the country a total expenditure of 67·8 crores and a net addition of 6·38 crores to its annual expenditure."

RAILWAY EXTENSION: FINANCIAL LOSS.

"The vigorous prosecution of railway construction has, partly owing to the falling exchange and partly because several of the new lines are strategic only, largely increased the net loss to the State during the period. The loss in 1883-84 was only 30 lakhs; it is now in the current year 2·149 crores. The aggregate loss on this account in excess over the figure for 1883-84 comes up to 14·4 crores."

DISCONTENT AND DISSATISFACTION.

With fresh extensions, the loss must go on increasing—unless the accident of improved exchange comes in to save the situation. The exchange compensation to the European Services is placed in painful dramatic balance with the increased Salt revenue. "The consumption of this prime necessity of life is now 26 lakhs of maunds short of the normal —which means that 80 millions and more of our struggling poor, who alone cannot afford to buy enough salt when it is dear, are forced to cut down their supply by 3 lbs. per head."

> "The reckless policy of a practically irresponsible and despotic bureau is permitted to determine the expenditure of the Empire, and the expenditure so established is made to determine the level of public taxation, *which, however, does not bear any normal relation to the tax-paying capacity of the people*. . . . . Everyone with disquieting anxiety waits to see what may be the next turn of the fiscal screw. Further, among the more intelligent classes in the country there is an increasing sense of keen discontent and dissatisfaction at the way in which all this money, so squeezed out, is so recklessly squandered away amidst the inaccessible wilds and sandy deserts, far away outside the limits of the country; and, indeed, it is impossible to hold one's patience when one finds that the unfortunate country is being so ruthlessly bled—for the purpose of extending the benefits of civilised rule to semi-barbarous tribes inhabiting the wild border-lands of the Empire."

The author justly points out that "it is the system —the entire financial management of the country— which is responsible for the present difficulties; and, unless there is a change—a radical change in the system—the root of the evil will remain untouched. It is the machinery, and not the product nor its working agents, on which we have to concentrate our attention."

WANTED: EFFECTIVE CONTROL.

What is wanted is, on the testimony of such men as Professor Fawcett, Sir David Barbour, and Sir Auckland Colvin, a really effective control over expenditure, the existing safeguards having proved illusory and the constitutional machinery being apparently altogether inadequate. We hope that this pamphlet will be widely read and studied in England, as well as in India.

The July number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* contains articles by Captain Frank E. Younghusband on "India and Africa," Alexander Rogers on "Rayatwari Settlements in India," and B. H. Baden-Powell on "Tribal Law in the Punjab."

[1] "The Present Financial Situation: A Grave Crisis." Poona: Printed at the Arya-Bhushana Press. 1896.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Government's withdrawal of the Education Bill, which Mr. Balfour announced on June 22nd, will have the effect of relieving the congestion of business in the House of Commons. It ought, therefore, to make it comparatively easy for Mr. Balfour to fulfil his promise—given at the close of the recent debate on the cotton duties—to bring on the Indian Budget at an early day, and allow time, not indeed for adequate discussion, but for less meagre discussion than usual.

The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure continues its sittings at the India Office, but without admitting the public or representatives of the press. It is rumoured, however, that in this respect the precedent of the Liquor Licensing Laws Commission, to which we called attention last month, may be followed. There is also ground for believing that an *interim* report may shortly be issued, and a volume containing the first portion of the evidence.

At the annual meeting of the General Council of the National Reform Union, which was held in the Memorial Hall, Manchester, on June 17th, Sir W. Wedderburn delivered a short speech on Indian affairs. He said that "it always gave him great pleasure to speak on behalf of India to a Lancashire audience, because Lancashire had a predominant influence over the fortunes of India, and in the second place, because he believed the interests of Lancashire and those of India, if properly understood, would be found to be identical. India was a great national inheritance—an inheritance that should be used for the credit and advantage both of Great Britain and India itself. In order that that might be done it was absolutely necessary that there should be an effective national control over Indian affairs, and in his opinion that control ought to be of a financial character, and must be exercised by the House of Commons. (Cheers.) When we looked at what had been going on in late years we did not find that Indian affairs had been administered in a way to improve the good name of this country. He especially reminded them of the case of the waste from the Chitral war. (Hear, hear.) By the expedition to Chitral we had done no good but a great deal of harm to India by breaking down the barrier of mountains that separated India from Russia, and killing and dispersing the brave natives who manned these ramparts. (Hear, hear.) We promised these tribes to retire from the mountains when we rescued our garrison, but we had broken a pledge made before the world. That was not the way to increase our reputation either for wisdom or honesty. (Hear, hear.)"

"Then," continued Sir W. Wedderburn, "there was this new matter of sending Indian troops to Suakin. No one knew the object in going to the Sudan, but certainly it was not to do India any good. It was proposed to make the Indians pay for the troops—an unjust and unwarrantable act. He believed the sense of justice of the British people would not permit of this thing being done. The result of all the waste and extravagance that was going on was that the people of India were frightfully overtaxed, paying a heavier taxation than any other people in the world. For a pennyworth of salt the Indian had to pay forty pence. And now the Government had placed the duties upon imports into India, which had so much interfered with trade and caused so much dissatisfaction throughout the country. India ought really to be a gold mine to us, but instead of getting dividends from it we only got calls. Sir William complained that there was no discussion of the Indian Budget, and urged that a small committee of members should make themselves understand the figures and make them clear to the House. The native Indians in the Viceroy's Council should also be encouraged to discuss the Budget." (Hear, hear.) Sir W. Wedderburn also spoke at the evening meeting in the Free Trade Hall which was addressed by Mr. John Morley.

On Saturday afternoon, June 12th, a special meeting of the London Indian Society was held at Montague Mansions, Bloomsbury, in order to consider the circumstances of the employment of Indian troops in the Sudan expedition. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who presided, said that the occasion was one equally of congratulation and complaint, the ground of congratulation being that the complaint would lead to a general awakening of British opinion with regard to the inequalities of the administration in India. He was fully impressed with the general benefits of English rule, but he trusted that the evident injustice of charging the Indian revenues with the cost of Indian troops in the Sudan would lead to a just appreciation of other grievances of which the natives of India had to complain. A resolution to the effect that no part of any expenditure, ordinary or extraordinary, incurred in employing Indian troops in the Sudan expedition should be charged upon the Indian revenues was agreed to.

In connexion with the discussion as to who shall pay for the Indian troops employed at Suakin, it is worth while (wrote the *St. James's Gazette* on June 10th) to note what India pays for the British troops employed in India. In the first place, the whole cost of the troops from the time they leave England to the time they return is borne by the Indian Government. In addition various payments are made to the British War Office for the training of the troops and for their pensions. The amounts of these payments will be found in the recently published account of the Home Charges of the Indian Government. They are:—

EFFECTIVE.	
Payments to War Office in respect of British forces serving in India....	£729,520
NON-EFFECTIVE.	
Payments to War Office for retired pay, etc., of British forces for service in India	£431,195
	£1,160,715

In other words, India pays not only the whole both of the ordinary and of the extraordinary expenses of the British troops she employs while they are on Indian service, but in addition pays a proportion of

the cost of their training in England and a proportion of their retiring allowances.

The visit of the Shahzada to this country was expensive—to India. In the Home Charges of the Indian Government for the year ending March 31, 1896, the following item appears:—

Expenses of the visit to England of his Highness the Shahzada Nazrullah Khan £25,408

Sir John Colomb has given notice in the House of Commons of the following motion: "To call attention to the over-sea employment of Her Majesty's Indian forces, and to the particular proposal for their employment at Suakin; and to move, That, in view of the want of practical knowledge and administrative experience of India which characterises generally the members of this House, and having regard to the magnitude and complexity of Indian affairs, Debates partaking in any sense of a Party character relating to arrangements agreed upon by the Government of India and the responsible Advisers of Her Majesty are not advantageous to the welfare of the British Empire."

A highly satisfactory report as to the progress of the Poona High School for girls has reached us. The new school house is now almost completed, and it is hoped that the school may re-assemble in it after the vacation. The school has succeeded beyond the expectations of its best friends. It has surmounted many obstacles and prejudices, and won the confidence of the people. The pupils attend school more regularly, pay fees, and walk long distances. The carriage which was formerly kept for their use has been discontinued for nearly three years. At present there are seventy-two pupils in the "high school" classes. The "preparatory" class below this standard—the class which eleven years ago was the "high school" class for beginners—has been embodied in the primary school. The "high school" is now, therefore, a high school in reality, and fulfils all the Government requirements. Six pupils have matriculated, three of whom have become teachers, while two are now studying in the Grant Medical College in order to take up the medical profession. The boarding institution has been remarkably successful. There are now sixty-one girl boarders from distant parts of India, and the rooms are being enlarged to provide for a few more after the vacation.

The first of the so-called "test" matches between England and the ninth Australian team began at Lord's on June 22nd. A good deal of comment was aroused by the omission, or exclusion, of K. S. Ranjitsinhji from the English team. The Indian amateur is undoubtedly one of the best cricketers in the world, and if he has any real title to play for Sussex it seems strange that he should not have been thought eligible to play for England. But, so far as we are aware, it has not been stated on authority that Ranjitsinhji was omitted from the team because he was not born in England; and we may yet see him taking the field for "England." With regard to the birth qualification, it may be of interest to state that Lord Harris, who has appeared for England in more than one memorable match, was born in Trinidad; and that Midwinter appeared for England against Australia in 1881-2, and for Australia against England in 1878. We shall be reluctant to believe that the Committee of the Marylebone Club have left the Indian amateur out of the list because of his nationality.

INDIAN TROOPS IN THE SUDAN.

WILL INDIA HAVE TO PAY?

RUMOURED SECOND THOUGHTS.

At the time of writing it is generally expected that the Cabinet will reconsider its decision with reference to the "ordinary" expenses of the Indian troops despatched to the Sudan.

On the eve of the Whitsuntide recess Mr. Balfour stated that the resolution to authorise a charge upon the Indian revenues would be taken on Thursday, June 4th. Notice had already been given of the the resolution (which was printed in our last issue), and it stood on the Paper in the name of Lord George Hamilton.

But on June 2nd Mr. Balfour stated in the House of Commons that a telegram had been received from the Government of India "urging that the matter should not be gone on with until her Majesty's Government had received and considered a despatch embodying their views on the subject." "That," Mr. Balfour added, "is a request which we cannot refuse, and under these circumstances I am afraid I must ask the House to pass from the arrangement fixed for Thursday, and allow the matter to stand over to a later day."

Mr. Balfour's announcement that the resolution would be postponed seemed to many persons to be rather odd, as Lord George Hamilton had, a few minutes earlier, replied to questions on the subject without even hinting at any such postponement.

What made it still more odd was the fact that, in earlier discussions of the question, Lord George Hamilton had stated that the views of the Government of India would be "fully considered" before the Home Government arrived at any decision. That was on May 12th. Three days later — on May 15th—Lord G. Hamilton announced the decision of the Home Government, and gave notice of the authorising resolution.

Perhaps it was merely a coincidence that, in the meantime, the Italian Green-books, and their inconvenient contents, had become public property, and that any discussion on the Sudan question would have been embarrassing to the Government.

But, at any rate, the supporters of the Government assumed that its object was to avoid discussion at that time. Notice was given of "blocking" resolutions to prevent a motion for adjournment. Mr. Labouchere, it is true, succeeded in evading these resolutions and forcing a debate. But that only shows that he was more ingenious than the authors of the "blocking" resolutions.

In any case, the postponement of the authorising resolution is all to the good so far as India is concerned, and we sincerely trust that it is an indication of a change of mind on the part of the Government.

The subject has continued to attract considerable attention in the British press. Want of space prevents us from giving many extracts, but we append two valuable articles which have appeared in the *Times*, together with a report of Mr. Morley's admirable speech at Leeds.

It will be noticed that at the close of the first article the writer says that if the Government changes its mind it will be "a great national triumph. For it will be the victory of the nation's sense of what is right over its power to do wrong." This is really very funny. The Government first decides to do wrong, and gives notice of a resolution to that effect. Then, when it decides to do what it ought to have done at first, it produces a "great national triumph."

MR. MORLEY SPEAKS OUT.

Mr. John Morley delivered on June 3rd, an important speech at Leeds at a conference summoned to consider the policy of the Government in the Sudan. Mr. Morley said in the course of his speech:—

I now come to the second point, which is, perhaps, the most important. I refer to the resort to Indian troops. (Hear, hear.) That marks a very grave and new departure. (Hear, hear.) You will remember that we were assured again and again that this was an Egyptian operation to be performed out of Egyptian finances. On March 19th Mr. Balfour said: "The operations are being undertaken in the interest of Egypt and the expenses will naturally be defrayed out of Egyptian funds." (Hear, hear.) It does not quite tally with the Green-book, this about the operations being undertaken in the interest of Egypt, but, at any rate, however that may be, mark this—if you are going to lend Egypt Indian troops, then the cost of those operations will not be defrayed out of Egyptian funds unless the Egyptian Government pay the ordinary and extraordinary charges of these troops. This is a passage I want to call your attention to. The Chancellor of the Exchequer on April 23rd said: "The Egyptian Government have undertaken this expedition with their own forces and at their own cost." But if you are going to lend them Indian troops—I see that something like 2,500 Indian troops have already landed at Suakin—if you are going to lend them Indian troops, who will release a corresponding force of Egyptian troops at Suakin for operations elsewhere, you can no longer say that the Egyptian Government have undertaken this business with their own forces. (Hear, hear.) Again and again we were told that we should measure the magnitude of our military operations in the Sudan by the military and financial resources of Egypt, and on April 14th the Secretary of State for India said he saw no reason at all to suppose that the Egyptian Army was not adequate to the task. But you now see for yourselves that that calculation is falsified and that the Egyptian army is not adequate to the task, or they would not have resorted to troops from India. Now, there is more than one point of the highest constitutional importance involved in this resort to Indian troops. The objects, mark you, of this expedition are unlimited. I defy any man who has followed these debates ever so closely, these declarations of the Government, attenuated as they are, to say what is the limit of the object of these operations. Then what are you going to do? They are not specific operations, not for a limited time, not for a definite purpose. If you assent without protest to this resort to Indian troops you are going to admit that there is an unlimited reservoir of Indian forces which may be employed for these unlimited and indefinite objects. (Cheers.) I do not believe any serious man who thinks about such a position as that will feel that it is a safe or a prudent position. Of course, we all know that if the Empire were in danger, if it were a case of self-preservation, we should resort to Indian troops under proper conditions, but this is not a question of self-preservation. This is not a question that India is particularly interested in. Indeed, I can imagine there might be those who might say that the interests of India as a producer, producing corn, cotton, and other commodities which Egypt also produces—that the material interests of India and Egypt are by no means identical, but that is a point I will not dwell upon this afternoon.

INDIA AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

I am dwelling upon the point that you ought not on any account to make it a matter of course that for any purpose Indian troops are to be resorted to, and above all we shall be prepared to show, when the proper day comes, that to resort to these troops without the assent of Parliament is an invasion of an Act of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) They may refine about that as they please, but you will never persuade me that there is any place where a more rigorous and exact construction ought to be insisted upon in an Act of Parliament, where such a construction ought to be more jealously insisted upon, than in the High Court of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) I see that last night a member of Parliament put upon the paper this notice of a motion—I wish to show you how things are going. The gentleman is not exactly an oracle of wisdom, I admit, but, still, this is his motion—"In view of the want of practical knowledge and administrative experience of India which characterises generally the members of the House (laughter), and having regard to the magnitude and complexity of Indian affairs, debates partaking in any sense of a party character relating to any arrangements agreed upon by the Government of India and the responsible advisers of her Majesty are not advantageous to the welfare of the British Empire." (Laughter.) Gentlemen, do you realise that? Of course, that is a very silly motion, but then I have observed, and I dare say that you have before now, that silliness very often only puts into capital letters ideas that are lurking at the back of the minds of people who pass for being decently sensible. We shall be prepared to debate that motion, that the House of Commons is so ignorant of Indian affairs that we must allow Her Majesty's Government in Downing Street and the Government at Calcutta to do whatever they like. We shall see whether that view prevails or not. If we are anything we are the guardians of the interests of the unrepresented natives of India. (Cheers.) It is even more important that we should recognise our representative duty to them than it is to you, because you can call us if we displease you—you do (laughter) —quickly to account, you can make yourselves heard, you can press your views and opinions upon us; but the natives of India cannot, and I want to ask your consideration of a matter to which we shall invite the attention of the House of Commons when the time comes, and that is the payment of these troops. (Hear, hear.) The proposal as I understand it—though it is not yet definitely settled—it would appear that the proposal is that the extraordinary charges of this Indian force shall be paid either by Great Britain or by Egypt. That is not settled, but anyhow India is to pay the ordinary charges of the troops that she lends to Egypt. It is said—and I want you to be so kind as to follow this argument, if you will, in anticipation, because you will hear, I have no doubt, plenty of discussion on it by-and-bye—it is said, "Why should not India pay the ordinary charges of these troops going to the Sudan? She would have to keep them anyhow." That is not the way it presents itself to the population of India. What they say is this, what they ask is this—at whose cost have these Indian forces been drilled, trained, armed and equipped for your service? At the cost of the Indian taxpayer. Second, from whom are they to draw day by day their regular pay while engaged in these operations of yours? From funds provided by India. You cannot wonder that, that being the case, the answer to those questions being those two answers, the Indian population and the Indian Government say, "If you are going to take our troops, you or Egypt ought to bear the whole burden."

LORD SALISBURY'S OPINION IN 1867.

I have got an admirable authority for that view, and an admirable authority not only for that view as to the comparatively secondary matter regarding the source from which the payment of this force is to come, but as to the whole policy. In the year 1867 an Indian contingent was brought to help in operations in Abyssinia. There was a debate in the House of Commons, and the late Mr. Fawcett—then a comparatively new member—said, "I object altogether to any por-

tion of the expense of this contingent falling upon India," and he divided the House upon that and went into the lobby with men like Mr. Bright and Mr. Forster. (Hear, hear.) But a statesman who is still living, who now occupies the very highest position of Government authority in this country—he was Lord Cranborne then, he is now Lord Salisbury—Lord Cranborne made a speech, and what did he say? I do not quote it, believe me, for any purpose of party recrimination, because for anything I know he holds those opinions to this hour—(a laugh)—and will perhaps act upon them. I have no doubt he will act upon them if he still holds the opinions, that is, if he has not changed his opinions, which he has a right to do as others have done. But this I know, that a more excellent expression of a sounder or a profounder view I do not know than this sentence, which I will take the liberty of reading. Lord Cranborne—he was supporting Mr. Fawcett—said, "I do not like India to be looked upon as an English barrack in the Oriental seas from which we may draw any number of troops without paying for them. It is bad for England, because it is always bad for us not to have that check upon the temptation to engage in little wars which can only be controlled by the necessity of paying for them. If this garrison which we keep in India is, as all Indian authorities assure us, necessary for maintaining that country in security and peace, that garrison ought not to be rashly diminished. If, on the other hand, it is too large and India can for any length of time conveniently spare these troops, then the Indian population ought not to be so unnecessarily taxed." (Hear, hear.) I repeat, that is a profound and wise view, admirably expressed, as Lord Salisbury has the gift of doing; it is a view which I have to impress upon you this afternoon with reference to the general aspect of the Sudan case. It is not good for us to barrack on Oriental seas military forces without paying for them. It is bad for us. It either indicates that we have more troops in India than it is necessary to keep there, or some other case.

A WARNING.

I am not going to detain you any longer, but I hope I have succeeded in showing you that there are many grounds on which we are justified in protesting against these events. (Cheers.) You hear a great deal now about something that is called "Imperial instinct." (Laughter.) I am proud of our great Empire, of all the noble and beneficent work that it has done all over the face of the globe, as any jingo among them. (Hear, hear.) But there is a sham and a counterfeit and a bastard kind of Imperial instinct—(cheers)—of which in these days we are hearing a good deal too much, and which, if you do not keep your eyes open, will land the country in mischief. (Hear, hear.) People sink the difference between right and wrong; they ride roughshod over facts and over reasonable probabilities; they brush aside considerations of prudence and policy such as those I have been endeavouring to bring before you this afternoon, and they call that Imperial instinct. (Hear, hear.) Now, let us come to the practical point. So far nothing worse has been done than the perpetration of a clumsy blunder in reference to the Sudan, but, if persisted in, what is now only a clumsy blunder will wax and grow, as it has done before in connexion with this same land, till it becomes a very grave peril and a hateful crime. (Hear, hear.) I hope you agree with me that a modern war is the most hateful of all. (Cheers.) You have had Sudan affairs to consider before. You found before that you were beaten, not by men but by nature, and if you allow yourselves to drift into this enterprise, which will become, from a blundering enterprise, a criminal enterprise, you will find yourselves beaten again. Now is the time for reflection. It has not yet become a party matter. You must now resist mischief. You, gentlemen, are persons of influence and consideration in your various localities. You are, I am sure, or you would not be here at considerable personal inconvenience, men in whom party spirit is secondary, as it ought to be, to conviction. (Hear, hear.) If I have done anything to strengthen the conviction, I do hope that you will use every means within your power to put pressure upon everybody over whom you have influence, including even members of Parliament—(laughter)—to insist either that we shall have a clear, definite, and intelligible statement of the reasons why Egypt is now pushed into the Sudan, and why Indian troops are being brought into the Sudan, or, if no such reason can be given, that the Government shall desist from the enterprise on which they have so rashly and indefensibly embarked. (Loud cheers.)

Responding to a vote of thanks, Mr. Morley said:

I have to thank you very sincerely for the cordial reception of this vote of thanks and for the great patience with which you were good enough to listen to my story of this expedition. I confess that when I was first invited to come here I felt that I would prefer coming to a gathering of these dimensions rather than one of those gigantic public gatherings I have had the honour of addressing in Leeds before now. This case is at present in the condition which requires cool, patient, close, and steady regard to the facts. I hope that at all public meetings, great or small, one does one's best to give cool, close, and steady attention to the facts, but when you have many extracts to read and dates to give, and so forth, no doubt there are advantages in a gathering of this kind. I hope that each one of you will become persuaded of the rights of that of which I have been speaking and will each become a centre for spreading the conviction amongst your neighbours. (Cheers.)

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

The writer of the article entitled "Indian Affairs" said, in the *Times* of June 8th:—

Mr. Balfour respected the best sense of the nation in deferring the debate on the Suakin contingent until the Government of India's despatch reaches this country. The decision now to be arrived at as to the fair payment for the Indian troops will have far-reaching consequences. For it is evident that the extension of the British power in tropical Africa must lead to demands, both industrial and military, upon the Indian races with a frequency heretofore unknown. Meanwhile from India itself come signs of a gathering storm such as has not arisen for many years. Whatever the tenour of the official communication now on its way from the Viceroy, there can be no question as to the view which our countrymen in India and the Indians themselves take of the situation. The papers urge the injustice of charging the regular pay of the Suakin contingent to the Indian taxpayer with a unanimity and a force of conviction to which no British statesman should turn a deaf ear. It is hard to imagine more different treatments of the question than those adopted by the leading Bombay papers brought by last mail. The *Times of India* appeals to the statutes which form the constitutional law as between Britain and her great dependency. The *Bombay Gazette* deals strictly with the individual instance. The result in each case is a powerful protest against a course of action which these papers, in common with the whole native and European Press of India, condemn as impolitic, dangerous, and unjust.

The constitutional opponents take their stand on the Act for the Better Government of India which governs the situation. "Except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of her Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not without the consent of both Houses of Parliament be applicable to defray any military operations carried on beyond the external frontiers of such possessions by her Majesty's forces charged upon such revenues." It cannot be pretended that there is, in the present instance, "any actual invasion of her Majesty's Indian possessions." Nor can it be seriously maintained that there is a "sudden and urgent necessity" such as

would justify the Government in excepting it from the express provision of the Act. The financial critics come at once to closer quarters with the individual wrong-doing, and in words almost identical with those used some time ago in these columns. The British regiments employed in India are paid, equipped, and kept up as contiuous fighting units by the Indian taxpayer. The Indian troops intended by the British Government for Egyptian service are to be paid, equipped, and kept up as continous fighting units by the Indian taxpayer. They are taken by a *fiat* from Downing Street, says the *Bombay Gazette*, "for some purpose which may be Italian or Egyptian, or international, but is in no sense Indian. They go to the Sudan either (1) to enable Italy to hold Kassala against the Dervishes and to make head against the Abyssinians; or (2) to help Egypt to recover Dongola and co-operate in the reconquest of the Sudan; so that (3), when the time comes, Great Britain will be in a position to restore Egypt to the Egyptians not as it now is, but as it was when we first intervened in its domestic politics. Thus the Indian taxpayer is to be called upon to finance a military expedition which may subserve Italian or Egyptian interests, and respond to the new sentimentalism that seeks to re-establish the *status quo ante* in the Sudan as the indispensable preliminary to the evacuation of Egypt." In regard to the necessity for the expedition, or the wisdom of the policy which led to it, the Indian Press refrains from passing judgment. But it unanimously insists that the objects of the expedition, whether Italian or Egyptian, are certainly not Indian, and it protests against the heavily burdened Indian taxpayer being forced to find the daily pay for troops employed on another nation's service.

The Indian Press acknowledges the patriotic interest which India, in common with the other colonies and dependencies of Great Britain, has in the stability of our position in Egypt. But it points out that, while Great Britain has a still larger interest in the stability of our position in India, she contributes not a penny to the military maintenance of our position in India. The loss of the Sudan is nothing to India compared with what the loss of India would be to Great Britain, yet India is to be charged with the daily pay of the Indian regiments sent to recover the Sudan, while Great Britain charges to India the uttermost farthing for the British troops sent to India. The request of India is that the joint interest of the colonies and dependencies in our position in Egypt shall be fairly appraised and apportioned, and not be thurst upon India alone. Ceylon, Hong-kong, the great Australian colonies, and the other dependencies and settlements of Great Britain in the East have with India a common interest in the protection of the Suez Canal. On India falls the costly permanent burden of securing for Great Britain the Asiatic approach to the Canal at Aden. That might be fairly taken as a discharge in full of India's liability arising out of her joint interest, and any extra troops required for Egypt might be charged to the other colonies and dependencies, or defrayed by Great Britain if she feared to do so. Yet, as the Indian newspapers point out, the other colonies and dependencies "have not been asked to send a single regiment to the Sudan."

We have tried to eliminate any violent expressions of feeling. Such violent expressions tend to obscure the real issue. But it would be wrong to conceal the fact that the question "has evoked the strongest indignation amongst Europeans and natives alike." It must be remembered, however, that Lord George Hamilton merely follows a precedent which it would be difficult for any Ministry to disregard, unless supported by a strong expression of public opinion. Each occasion on which Indian troops have been borrowed by Great Britain seemed at the moment entirely exceptional, and in most cases India was made to defray their daily pay. In certain cases Great Britain refunded the cost in whole or part; as by a grant of five millions sterling to India for the 1878 expedition (Afghanistan), of £500,000 for that of 1882 (Egypt), or by payment of the whole cost as in the China expedition of 1859-60, and for the Indian troops sent to Malta in 1878. The intensity of feeling and the grave apprehension with which the action of the British Government is now being watched in India arise from the conviction that the present occasion cannot be regarded as accidental, and that it must form the precedent for regulating subsequent cases. If the Government should insist on establishing that precedent, it will harden an occasional injustice into a permanent wrong. The issue has been placed before Parliament in the clearest terms by Lord George Hamilton's proposed resolution and by the amendments of Mr. John Morley and others thereto.

It is not in reality a question for the Government, but for the nation. The British nation has the power to saddle the Indian taxpayer with this inequitable charge. Has the British nation the public virtue to abstain from doing so? It is always possible to find precedents for the ignobler course. In the present case it is particularly easy to do so. It is equally easy to obscure the real question by diverging into side issues, as was done by a correspondent in our columns last week. The question was not whether India should lend troops for Egyptian service "precisely on the same terms, pecuniary and otherwise," as she allows post-office clerks or railway labourers to go to tropical Africa. It was whether the British Government could justly take troops from India without paying their daily wages, while in every other branch of administrative or industrial employment payment has to be made. Nor will the plea avail that the troops are not needed in India, and may therefore be employed at India's cost in Africa. That plea would do us more harm in India than if we were forcibly to take the money and say nothing. For the standing complaint in India is that the Indian military expenditure is inflated and kept up at an undue height to suit the exigencies of British policy rather than to meet the needs of India herself. The list of occasions on which troops have thus been taken from India is already a long one, and suffices to give some colour to this complaint. If it were now to authoritatively go forth that the Indian Army is maintained at a standard which permanently suffices for British emergencies as well as for Indian defence, it would

falsify the statements made by successive Viceroys and successive Commanders-in-Chief in India during the past twenty-five years.

Unless Lord Salisbury's words in 1867 have been misrepresented, it is little likely that any such plea will be offered. England had then to deal with a real emergency, and the employment of Indian troops in Abyssinia seemed so absolutely exceptional as to minimise the risk of the terms being used as a precedent. Yet Lord Salisbury took the occasion to lay down from the first the principles which should regulate such transactions. When, as Lord Cranborne, he supported Mr. Fawcett against the charging the pay of the troops to India he said :—

"I do not like India to be looked upon as an English barrack in the Oriental seas from which we may draw any number of troops without paying for them. It is bad for England, because it is always bad for us not to have that check upon the temptation to engage in little wars which can only be controlled by the necessity of paying for them. If this garrison which we keep in India is, as all Indian authorities assure us, necessary for maintaining that country in security and peace, that garrison ought not to be rashly diminished. If, on the other hand, it is too large, and India can for any length of time conveniently spare these troops, then the Indian population ought not to be so unnecessarily taxed."

It is sincerely to be hoped, since the question has ceased to be an accidental one, and the decision of Parliament at the present must become the precedent for the future, that the principles which Lord Cranborne laid down in 1867 will weigh with Lord Salisbury in 1896. Many things have changed since then. But the temptation to shift burdens unfairly to the shoulders of the Indian taxpayer has not changed, and the difficulty of securing justice for India is almost as great as ever. It will form one of the historical triumphs of the Conservative party if, after having given to India the Queen's proclamation, which is the charter of the Indian races, and the recent Councils Law, which serves as the basis of Indian legislation by representation, they now join with all other parties in securing this great act of financial justice to India. But it will be a still greater national triumph. For it will be the victory of the nation's sense of what is right over its power to do wrong.

In a leading article on June 8th, the *Times* wrote : The question whether the expense of the contingent sent to Suakin is or is not to fall upon the Indian taxpayers will have to be considered as soon as the despatches from the Calcutta Government have been received. It must not be forgotten that India makes no contribution to the cost of the British Navy, which, nevertheless, constitutes the main defence of our Eastern possessions against foreign aggression. It cannot be contended, therefore, that the policy of this country tends, on the whole, to deal hardly with India in regard to such questions. Nevertheless, we adhere to our opinion that, whatever may be the technical rights as between the Imperial and the Indian Exchequers, it would be most inexpedient to create a precedent for throwing upon the taxpayers of India the whole or the greater part of the cost of protecting external interests in which England and other portions of the Empire are at least as directly implicated. Many years ago, when the present Prime Minster was in the House of Commons, he protested, during the Abyssian expedition, against treating India "as an English barrack in the Oriental seas from which we may draw any number of troops without paying for them."

Opinion in India.

The following excellent summary of opinion in India appeared in the *Times* for June 16th, under the heading "Indian Affairs" :

We can render no better service to the nation than by summarising the protests brought by last week's mail against charging India with the daily pay of the Suakin contingent. The Bombay Presidency Association had already telegraphed to the Secretary of State "humbly, but firmly, praying that no portion of the cost of the Indian troops be defrayed from Indian revenues. Otherwise, a universal feeling of deep injustice and discontent will result." The telegram, together with a memorial to the Viceroy, was signed by a member of Council of the highest standing in Western India. It very moderately describes the state of feeling which has now actually resulted. That feeling is intensified by the fact that the Indian Government has something very like a famine on its hands, or, rather, a widespread scarcity which, but for State relief on a large scale, would develop into famine. India has, by an enormous addition to her public burdens, just succeeded in staggering back to solvency. She finds it hard that the sacrifices which she has made should be taken advantage of to lay new and unjust burdens upon her. It is impossible to read the articles in the European and native Press without a conviction that by this act we shall be creating a widespread feeling of disloyalty which may undo at a stroke the work of years.

The loyalty of British India, it should never be forgotten, has been the slow product of the just administration of British India. We see in the persistent rebellion of Portuguese India the state of things produced by bad administration. Even in the depth of its present troubles, when one Viceroy has been superseded after another, and the King of Portugal's brother himself has acknowledged his military expedition to Goa a failure and had to abandon the attempt to put down the insurrection, miserable charges of peculation emerge. A committee at Goa is now inquiring whether one high officer went off with Rs.95,000 and another with Rs. 35,000. Such charges against the administrators of British India are unknown. The mere suspicion of personal malversation by a high Anglo-Indian official would send a thrill of indignation throughout both England and India. But India is now complaining of what she regards as an act of financial malversation on a far larger scale, against which she has no appeal except to the justice of the British nation.

A significant feature of the case is that the most strongly British organs in India feel themselves constrained to protest most emphatically against the proposed charge. "There is no precedent," says the *Calcutta Englishman*, "for Indian troops being employed to assist Egypt in recovering a province which was first of all driven into revolt by Egyptian

tyranny, and then abandoned to the Dervishes through Egyptian ineptitude. Precedent is to be dragged in by the heels to justify another imposition on India." "We know beforehand," writes the *Pioneer*, which represents the more official classes of our countrymen in India, "what arguments will be used to justify this policy. But, whatever force they may have as regards Egypt proper, they have hardly any reference to an advance into the Sudan. . . . . We have heard nothing before of Indian interests being involved, and at a time when this country is struggling with financial difficulties, while England has just realised one of the biggest surpluses on record, and Egypt has large reserves, it is surely too bad to borrow troops we can ill spare and then to make us pay for our assistance."

These are the best things that our friends can say for us. The *Hindu Patriot*, which holds a position to the wealthy and patriotic natives of Bengal similar to that which the *Englishman* does to the British independent community and the *Pioneer* to the administrative and general body, speaks in terms of deep sorrow. This act of injustice, if persisted in, will grave itself into the memory of the people. The *Indian Mirror*, the organ of the progressive classes in Bengal, declares that it could scarcely have credited that the British Government contemplated such a course, "but for a definite statement made from the Ministerial bench. India has no part or lot in Egypt's quarrel with the Mahdi. The re-conquest of the Sudan, if such a consummation is brought about, will bring gain to Egypt and glory possibly to England, but it will not bring a cent. to the Indian treasury." In a powerful leader on "The Iniquity of Making India Pay," the *Mirror* freely acknowledges that previous charges of the kind may be cited. But it points out that such wrongs done to India in the past were of an exceptional character, and it protests against their being converted into a permanent precedent. "Because Indian troops once or twice fought out of India, and their cost was wrested from the Indian Government, is that a reason why an act of similar injustice should be perpetrated again?" This is the popular and native way of putting what the British organs in India express with more exactitude and reserve. But it matters not to which province or to which class of journals we turn. The whole of the newspapers throughout India are saying the same thing each in its own way.

Organs of social and religious reform prefer to dwell on the immorality of the proceeding. "Does not the manner," asks the *Indian Spectator*, "in which the Ministers have been replying to the questions put to them show that they are doing things which their own conscience tells them they should not do?" A strong young political paper like the *Bombay Champion* takes its stand upon the purely political ground. "Why should India be a military reserve?" "Our Viceroys and Commanders-in-Chief," it says, "are always proclaiming that even the increased army strength of the country is not adequate. Either the Indian army is in excess of our present requirements or not. If it is, then the sooner the strength is reduced, and the taxpayer relieved of some portion of his present intolerable burdens, the better." The truth is that this attempt to charge India with the Suakin contingent has given a new force to the agitation against the ever-increasing military expenditure in India. It has reduced to the baldest terms the question, "Why should India be a military reserve?" "If troops can be spared from the Indian garrison," writes the *Calcutta Statesman*, "to fight battles thousands of miles away, in which India has no concern, not merely in the case of some exceptional emergency, but in order to enable England to wage wars the cost of which would be prohibitive if the operations were carried out entirely by British troops, the natural conclusion suggested is that the Indian garrison is larger than the circumstances of the country require, and that the people of India are being saddled with the cost of the excess for the benefit, or what her Majesty's Ministers conceive to be the benefit, of the British taxpayer."

We have been careful to quote only from journals which approach the question with a sense of responsibility as to the words which they employ. But a striking feature of the Indian Press, both British and native, is that on really great occasions it displays a grave solidarity of moderation unknown during a crisis in France or Germany, or in any country of Continental Europe. The Indian newspapers which most strenuously protest against the proposed charges are the most careful to acknowledge the Imperial liabilities of India. They admit that emergencies may arise in which India might fairly be called upon to lend troops. They also admit the existence of "broad Imperial considerations" which would, in a time of danger to the Empire, call forth the loyal and spontaneous help of India. "Within proper limits," says the *Calcutta Statesman*, "we are prepared to accept the principle" of joint responsibility. "And so, too, are we," comments the *Bombay Champion*. "But only on the condition that it is reciprocal, and that a line is drawn at what may be truly and jointly considered as Imperial interests." The present system of appealing to Imperial considerations whenever we want to make India pay, and of ignoring Imperial considerations whenever we wish in our own financial arrangements with India to save the pocket of the British taxpayer, is declared to be "a travesty of justice."

These are but a few of the embarrassing questions which the proposal to saddle India with the cost of the Suakin contingent has raised in India. They are extremely embarrassing questions. For they run counter to the most solemn declarations made by our Indian Government, and cast doubts upon the sincerity of every Viceroy and Finance Minister and Commander-in-Chief in India during the past twenty years. "The sole material interest which India possesses in Egypt," the Government of India declared on a memorable occasion, "is that the transit of ships through the Suez Canal should be assured. . . . . We do not understand on what principle of political equity India can be called upon to defray part of the cost of armed intervention in Egypt, unless the Australian and other colonies are called upon to pay their proportionate share." It must be remembered that India regards her external expenditure on behalf of Imperial interests as more than equivalent to what might be claimed as her contri-

bution to naval defence in Asiatic waters. That expenditure includes not only coast charges for the Red Sea and Persian Gulf and compulsory payments for establishments in connexion with Persia, China, and other countries far beyond her frontier. It also includes annual military contributions exceeding a million sterling, and now under the consideration of the Royal Commission, for the recruitment and pensions of the British Army at home. Such matters of permanent financial adjustment between Great Britain and India lie apart from the question now at issue.

THE TRANSVAAL AND INDIA.

[From the "Madras Review."]

If it were possible for us in India to arrive at some agreement with Englishmen on the great questions in debate concerning the Government of the country, or rather on the principles that ought to guide them, we might regard the future with equanimity and with hope. But we are confronted with the same difficulty in India which has been felt in almost every country in the world. Everybody will acknowledge that the sovereign has certain duties. The most despotic of rulers will readily concede that he is bound by what may be loosely called laws towards his subjects. The duties of kings are laid down in the old Hindu Sastras with a comprehensiveness which leave very little to be desired. The oligarchies of ancient Rome and of Venice acknowledged their responsibility for good government and their duties to the masses with the same readiness with which the ruling classes of England express their willingness to ameliorate the conditions of the poorer classes in England. Except perhaps in England, however, it has been left to the superior and governing classes to define their own duties as well as the obligations of the lower classes.

But to the lower classes the position taken by the apologists of the superior classes has always appeared unsatisfactory and generally the problem has been solved by civil war. There are, however, signs that by constitutional agitation, reforms, that in the olden days were attainable only by revolutions, could now be achieved by more peaceful means. India itself is a striking example, and the reforms that have been introduced acquire a remarkable significance as an indication of what is possible by persistent and constitutional agitation. In carrying on this agitation, nothing is more instructive as a lesson to ourselves and to our rulers than their conduct in those days when labouring under disabilities, but unfortunately the memories of those days are easily forgotten. A Puritan clamouring for liberty and toleration has been known, when in power, to be more tolerant towards other sects than his own oppressors. It is far more useful therefore to recall to the mind of our rulers how their own race, living under laws far more favourable than our own in India, are contemporaneously with ourselves claiming privileges, far higher than ever claimed by us. Transvaal is a Boer Republic, where the majority of the Europeans, the Uitlanders, have no franchise or share in the government of the country. Their grievances have been held to justify strong remonstrances from such men as Messrs. Balfour and Chamberlain. They have evoked great sympathy in England and have been regarded potent enough to palliate the armed raid of Dr. Jameson into Transvaal. Nowhere else in the world are Englishmen—for the great majority of Uitlanders are Englishmen—forced to beg concessions from a superior race. They have always formed the governing body and it has been their pride to point out to races subject to them the conditions under which alone the franchise could be granted and they could be allowed to take part in the government of the country. Transvaal is, we believe, the one place in the world where the governing body is of a different race, and the majority of the ruled are Englishmen who have no voice in the Government. It is instructive, therefore, to note under what conditions they consider that the franchise ought to be bestowed on them and compare such conditions with those that exist in other countries where the Englishmen themselves form the dominant race and other races have to crave of them the indulgence, which they now pray may be conceded to them in Transvaal.

The Uitlanders say that they are the vast majority in the State, owning more than half the land and taken in the aggregate, nine-tenths of the property; and yet in all matters affecting their properties, lives, or liberties they have no voice as they are denied the right to vote for election to the First Volksraad. They protest against any taxation without representation. And they maintain that taxes which in their view are most inequitable are imposed. They condemn a legislature which is elected only by a minority, one-third of the people. And they assume, as not requiring any argument to prove the same, that when such minority is composed of a different race, speaking a different language, with different pursuits and traditions from the majority, government by such minority stands self-condemned.

Turning to the executive government they complain that the power of the executive is absolute, with no responsibility to the people: that all legislation is initiated by the executive.

With reference to the courts which in the absence of representation in the Councils is the sole guardian of their rights, it is alleged that attempts are being constantly made to reduce them to a position subordinate to the Executive. The Uitlanders plead they have not got the right of being tried by a jury of their own countrymen, and that there is no chance of receiving even-handed justice in a trial before a jury of burghers. As to railways, it is a grievance that it is entirely in the hands of a corporation domiciled in Holland. The governing race is alleged to show a determination to retain all power in their own hands and to spend money on fortifications intended to terrorise the Uitlanders.

We believe we have fairly stated their grievances. Let us compare their position with ours. If in Transvaal they form a majority, being apparently double in numbers to the governing races, in India they form only an infinitesimal portion of the population. If in Transvaal they own nine-tenths of the

property, in India the majority of the Indians own almost the entire property. The difference between an Uitlander and a Boer is certainly not so wide as between an Englishman and an Indian. One would think, therefore, that the claims of the Indians for representation in the government of the Indian Empire are irresistible, but yet what do we find now?

In Transvaal they have at least an independent legislative council able to make its own laws and enforce them. In India we have really no such legislative council. In the Volksraad there are some members who are able and willing to help the Uitlanders, and if these Uitlanders succeed in persuading the free and independent members generally of the justice of their claim there is nothing to prevent the Volksraad from doing them justice. But in India there is no council, free and independent, to be persuaded. So that while the Uitlanders complain of non-representation in the Free Council of the Republic, we have to complain that there is no Free Council at all for the framing of the laws, and to superintend the administration of such laws.

The councils that exist in India are a mere mockery intended to shield the executive and to invest with an appearance of deliberation and fairness all their high-handed acts of tyranny. They can only register the verdicts of the executive, and the non-officials are appointed to congratulate the officials on the consummate ability, wisdom and tact which, in the opinion of the latter, they always display. There is of course no representation, as the members that sit in the legislative councils are not members really elected by independent voters, nor are these sham councils in any way useful for effective impartial legislation or control. The Budget is not submitted to them for their approval. And they have no control over the spending departments, which, so far as the councils are concerned, are free to do what they like. As the executive in India has such entire control over the legislative councils it is needless to state that the laws passed by such councils can scarcely be relied on to safe-guard the natural liberties of the people against the executive. Where the laws are not impartial the Judges can do little. Yet in India we know that attempts are persistently being made to bring the High Courts into subordination to the executive. As to the masses they are ground down in India by judicial tyranny. The tax-gathering collector, and not the administrator of justice, is the representative of the Queen. The magistrates depend for their promotion on the Revenue officials. And the entire administration of justice is subordinated to the prompt collection of an oppressive Revenue and to the maintenance of the prestige of the superior race. The Police are notoriously inefficient. From the highest to the lowest oppression descends through all the classes of society. Yet an Englishman in India if asked to apply a remedy by admitting the Indians to a share in the Government will regard such demand as absurd and beyond the pale of practical politics. The great moral force of England behind the Uitlanders, the great physical force of England to support the Anglo-Indians makes all the difference.

In Transvaal they plead that they have not the right to be tried by a jury of their own countrymen and that a jury of burghers will never mete out justice to them. In India it has been long recognised that trial by an English jury where the accused is an Englishman is a farce. The result is that the English soldier may commit any brutality with practical impunity. Well might an uncharitable Turk say in reply to Canon MacColl that it is not in Turkey alone that the members of the ruling race are free to commit certain offences with impunity, and that there is one law for the ruling race and another for the ruled.

As in Transvaal, the railways in India are generally in the hands of companies in England and are worked, not with a view to India's benefit and profits but as an investment for the Englishman and for the Englishman's profits. Above all, the money raised in India is not spent in India; crores and crores of rupees are for one reason or another poured into England, and the life blood of India is being slowly but surely drained on account of a want of any effective check by Indians over the expenditure. Far greater reason exists in India than in Transvaal why the great majority of the people of the country ought to be allowed a voice in the councils of the nation.

We have assumed throughout that the Transvaal Uitlanders' complaint is true that they have no effective voice in legislation. Let us examine this statement a little closely.

The Parliament of Transvaal consist of two chambers:—the first Volksraad, and the second Volksraad. The members of the first Volksraad, the President of the Republic, and the Commandant General are to be chosen by those who had the franchise previous to the year 1890 and their children, who can claim the franchise upon the attainment of the age of sixteen. Before 1890 those alone had the franchise who were burghers, and to be a burgher one must have been born within the Republic and attained the age of eighteen. Persons not born within the Republic could till then, but not subsequently, obtain burgher rights by a residence of five years and taking the oath of allegiance.

This franchise could also be acquired by those who, during a period of ten years, were qualified to be chosen as members of the second Volksraad, and after a resolution to that effect has been passed by the first Volksraad.

For the second Volksraad, besides those entitled to vote for the first Volksraad, a white male person coming from elsewhere could obtain the right to vote after a residence of two years if he conforms to the laws and takes the oath of allegiance to the Republic, renouncing the allegiance to the sovereign to whom till then he was subject.

The second chamber can legislate on the following:

(1) The mines, postal, telegraphic, and telephonic departments.
(2) The making and maintenance of waggon and postal roads.
(3) The protection of inventions, patterns, trade marks, and author's rights.
(4) The working and maintenance of forests and salt pans
(5) Company and insolvency laws.
(6) Civil and criminal procedure.

(7) Such other matters as the first chamber may entrust it with.

All the laws passed by the first chamber have the force of law and cannot be vetoed by the second except those that trench upon the above subjects.

The complaint is that no child born in Transvaal has, of right, the franchise unless his father was a burgher, or became naturalised under the rules above referred to, that no advantage of any value is derived by being able to vote for election to the second chamber, and that the chances of obtaining the right to vote for election to the first chamber are very remote.

Johannesburg is a mining town, and the second Volksraad have the right of legislation with reference to mines. It almost takes our breath away to see that the concession to legislate on the matters above referred to are considered of no advantage. If the people of India had power to legislate on the criminal procedure laws, the hateful distinction between the laws applicable to Europeans and those to natives would be swept away in a moment. If the Indians had a voice in the legislation concerning Forests and salt, is it to be supposed for a moment that the statute book would have been disfigured by the existing laws? In fact, President Kruger has only to inform the English Uitlanders that he proposes to follow the beneficent Government of England in India. Then nothing more will be heard of the Uitlander claim.

Mr. Balfour said something of the character of the Uitlanders which rendered it desirable that the franchise claimed should be conferred on them. The Boers were under the English dominion. Hating England's rule they emigrated northwards and settled in Transvaal, whither they were followed by the English Government. A revolt and the recognition of their independence was the result. They attempted to live peaceably with their English neighbours, and the naturalisation laws of 1884 passed by them were mild. In 1890 the second Volksraad was created to bring the original burghers and Uitlanders together as a step towards the fusion of the two Volksraads, even after the chief of the Republic was deliberately insulted when he visited Johannesburg by hauling down the Republican flag. But the English attitude continued hostile. There were strong indications to show that if the franchise were bestowed on the Uitlanders, it would be used by the majority of them, who were Englishmen, against the Republic, and that the Republic would be merged in the surrounding English countries. The Uitlanders will not take the oath of allegiance to the Republic. They will not take up arms against the foes of the Republic. They have been guilty of inviting armed intervention. Is it a wonder, then, that they are denied the right of franchise?

But what about India's past and present? Whatever an Englishman who knows not of India's past might say, it was India's sons, under the guidance of English statesmen and generals, that created the Indian Empire—as to her loyalty, it would be an insult to discuss that question. Thus we find all along that the attitude of Englishmen as regarded the mutual relations that ought to subsist between the rulers and the ruled, affords a strange contrast in the two continents of Asia and Africa. What little they grudge so much to give away as rulers in India, they indignantly demand as the ruled in the other. In Transvaal they ask for concessions which, even in spite of strong grounds, they superciliously deny to us in India; and, strange to say, they have the sympathetic conscience of influential England to back them up in their demands, which we practically have not. Curiously enough, they maintain that one set of political principles should guide them as a ruling race, and a diametrically opposite set should govern them when under a foreign domination.

Finally, we have only to ask Englishmen to bear in mind when considering India's claims, that the President of the Union, Mr. Charles Leonard, on behalf of the Uitlanders, claimed, with the approval and sympathy of the English race, "representation" as one of the elementary rights of citizenship.

Reviews.

INDIAN CRIMINAL LAW.

The Criminal Law of India. By JOHN D. MAYNE. (Madras: Higginbotham and Co. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co. Bombay: Thacker and Co. London: W. Clowes and Sons, Limited.)

Mr. Mayne's name is a well-known guarantee for able, painstaking, and solid work. This is a thick volume of a thousand close-packed pages, most carefully compiled, independently and vigorously thought out, and expressed with masterly lucidity. It supersedes Mr. Mayne's Commentary on the Penal Code. The First Part consists of a print of the text of the Indian Penal Code, with running commentary, clause by clause, and references to the Second Part. It occupies 228 pages. The Second Part offers a methodised view of the Criminal Law at present administered in India, so far as it is based on the Penal Code, the Criminal Procedure Code, and the Evidence Act. In his exposition Mr. Mayne makes an unusually extensive use of the decisions of the Civil Courts—a procedure justifiable on the merits, and likely to be especially welcomed by advocates and judges out of reach of the law libraries of the Presidency towns. He has also made very large reference to English authorities in his explanations of the Code, undeterred by the reprobation of the practice by the Judicial Committee. We are on Mr. Mayne's side. You cannot turn the leaves of any volume of Indian reports without seeing that he is following the example of the Indian Courts; and he justly feels bound to "supply the local Bar and Bench with the authorities by which their proceedings will undoubtedly be tested on appeal." Besides, in the application of the clear-cut rules of the Code to the multifarious facts of the various cases, "the recorded experience of centuries of English experts must be of the highest importance." The volume is undoubtedly a great contribution to the exposition and elucidation of a most important branch of law; and it will be found useful for reference in England as well as in India, notably on the discussion of principles.

MEN OF THE SOUTH.

Representative Men of Southern India. (Madras: Price Current Press. 1896.)

"Let us praise famous men and the fathers that begat us." It was a happy thought of Mr. G. Paramaswaran Pillai, the enterprising Editor of the *Madras Standard,* to publish in his paper a series of sketches of the distinguished men of Southern India. Now he has selected for separate publication the lives of a dozen of these representative men, with portraits which, though on a small scale, nevertheless show the interesting faces of the group. We should have been better pleased if Mr. Pillai had given us two or three dozen sketches, instead of one; indeed, we should have welcomed his "Portrait Gallery" entire. The fame of many of the men may as yet be only local, but one likes to keep in view the rising as well as the completed careers of men that do good service in their day and generation. The selection now before us represents a remarkable variety of public work:

> "Among the Princes and Zemindars of Southern India none are better known than Sir Rama Varma, the late Mahárájá of Travancore, and Sir Vizia Rama, the late Mahárájá of Vizianagram. Sir Madava Row, V. Ramiengar, C. V. Runga Charlu, and A. Sheshia Sastri are acknowledged on all hands to be the most distinguished of South Indian statesmen. As a linguist, C. V. Runganada Sastri has left behind him a reputation which is unique. As a jurist, none has surpassed Sir T. Muthusawmy Aiyar. In the field of education, nobody has yet been found to take the place of Rai Bahadur Gopal Row and Rai Bahadur Runganada Mudaliar. And there breathed not sturdier patriots than Gazulu Lakshminarasu Chetty and Salem Ramasawmy Mudaliar."

With a single exception—Mr. Seshia Sastri—they are all dead and gone. But their memory is dearly cherished by their countrymen, and their influence is a living force for good to-day. It is irrelevant to enquire whether they were "great" men, or to classify them in the world's scale of notoriety. They were at least the salt of the society they adorned, and we should be glad if means could be found of making known to Englishmen at home the qualities that endeared them to their compatriots and influenced their own society.

We shall confine ourselves to picking out a few illustrative points. Sir Rama Varma did much for reform in Travancore. "Department after department was taken up and reorganised—the Judiciary, the Revenue, the Police, the salt, down to the anche and the elephant; in spite of the clamours of the time, who can say that each was not left on the whole either better ordered or better manned?" The Revenue Survey and Settlement was a great scheme, boldly conceived and executed. His Highness, "in earnest and indefatigable application to business, was a model for the whole service to follow. . . . His daily routine was a routine of incessant labour. Scarcely any lamp in the town was put out later in the night, or lit up earlier in the morning, than the reading-lamp on the Mahárájá's writing-desk." He took a personal and very practical interest in science. Sir Vizia Rama of Vizianagram was in charge of his zemindary for thirty years, and "it may be said without exaggeration that he lived and died a model prince." These rulers present a very different picture from the traditional voluptuary of popular imagination.

Sir Madava Row, "the Turgot of India," as Mr. Fawcett styled him, did admirable service as Dewan of three native States—Travancore, Indore, and Baroda; and perhaps he is the best known of the series. Mr. V. Ramiengar did excellent work both as administrator and as legislator, and Sir Alexander Arbuthnot publicly said of him that "whether as regards the uprightness of his character, the excellence of his judgment, the honesty of his purpose, or the independence of his action, he has not his superior in any one of the legislative bodies now at work in this great Indian Empire." Runga Charlu, the son of a clerk in the Chingleput Collectorate, ably administered, under trying conditions, the province of Mysore; and it was he who, as Dewan, organised the Representative Assembly. Seshia Sastri, also the son of poor parents, succeeded Sir Madava Row as Dewan of Travancore, and later became Dewan of Pudukota. On his retirement from the latter post, Lord Wenlock said: "The result of his labours has been so successful that what was at the time of his accession to office almost a wreck is at the present moment a prosperous possession." The capacity, energy, resolution, and integrity of such administrators well deserve a permanent record; and stay-at-home Englishmen ought to be made acquainted with the facts.

Sir T. Muthusawmy Aiyar left behind him the reputation of a great judge—a reputation that rests on most solid foundations. Runganada Sastri, who rose to the Legislative Council, was the greatest linguist of India. He was master of fourteen languages at his death, and was busy at a fifteenth. Gopal Row spent his energies in the Educational Department, mainly in connexion with the Kumbakonam College. "It is no disparagement to many well-known names," wrote Dr. Miller, "when we say that few of the educated sons of Southern India held so high a place in the regard of natives and Europeans equally, and that fewer still have done so much to mould the generations that are to come." Runganada Mudaliar, too, was a teacher—a Professor in the Presidency College. "His devotion to public duty, his services as a teacher and a professor, as an educationist, and as a friend of progress, were invaluable." Such was the opinion of Sir Muthusawmy Aiyar. The reputation of Lakshminarasu Chetty and Ramasawmy Mudaliar rests on the courage, strenuousness, and level-headedness of their action as public men.

"IMPERFECT DISINFECTION IS NO DISINFECTION AT ALL."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder

IS

"CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. CALVERT'S No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.

In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).

Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed. Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ AVOID WORTHLESS IMITATIONS MADE WITH TAR OILS.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says: "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer.*"

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

There is much satisfaction in the commemoration of men whose work has been done in the less prominent walks of life, but whose influence may not on that account be the less pervading, powerful, and permanent. In this connexion, too, it is very pleasant to note the far-reaching effects of the work of several English teachers—especially of Mr. Powell, Principal of the Madras High School, afterwards Director of Public Instruction, "the pioneer of higher education in Southern India," who had as pupils a large proportion of these distinguished and useful men. Speaking of this veteran educationist, Runga Charlu said:

"When I recall to my mind the singleness of purpose and devotion with which he gave himself up to the education of those placed under his care during a period attended with many discouragements and difficulties . . . . and when I reflect that he was able to continue with undiminished interest these by no means easy labours during the period of nearly a a quarter of a century, it is impossible not to be overpowered with a feeling of admiration and gratitude. Remarkable as he was for the thoroughness and precision of his teaching and the extensive range of information which he was able to place before his students, that which most impressed their mind was, I think, the silent but enduring influence of his high and exemplary character."

Such are the services that go beyond all others to the making of a nation.

It is further interesting to see that at least five of the men here commemorated rose from the humblest beginnings:

"Sir Muthusawmy Aiyar began life on a salary of Re. 1 *per mensem*. Ramiengar's father was hardly able to educate his son. It would have been impossible for Runga Charlu to get himself educated without the generous help he received from some of his distant relatives, Runganada Sastri owed his education entirely to the generosity of a District Judge. Seshia Sastri was equally poor. All these were men whom poverty had inured to hardship, and necessity had compelled to exertion; and the habits they had acquired in the early school of difficulty had served them in good stead in later years."

Another moral to be drawn from those lives—a moral of the highest practical concern—may also be given in the words of Mr. Pillai:

"The British Government in spite of their just laws and love of fair play, afford little scope for distinction to natives and give them little encouragement. We wonder what would have been the fate of Sir Madava Row, Runga Charlu, Ramiengar, and Seshia Sastri, if there were no Native States in India. Ramiengar would have retired as Superintendent of Stamps or Inspector-General of Registration; to Seshia Sastri no more responsible place would have been open than that of Head Sheristadar of the Board of Revenue; the ambition of Runga Charlu would have leapt no higher than the appointment of a Deputy Collector; and Sir Madava Row would have at best been an efficient revenue officer. These officers would have afforded little room for the display of their intellectual attainments, or for the exercise of their statesman-like instincts and they would have lived and died like any other plodding, prospering official in the Revenue Department under Government. . . . .

"Even Gopal Row and Runganada Mudaliar, whose abilities were of the highest, were the lesser lights they were on account of the restrictions placed on them by the British Government. In spite of his great reputation as a teacher, his recognised ability, and the success and distinction with which he had conducted the duties of principal for three years in the Kumbakonam College, Gopal Row was never confirmed as Principal, and it was several years subsequently that he was admitted even into the graded service as Professor of History and Political Economy in the Presidency College. Runganada Mudaliar was not treated a whit better. A man of his genius had to act as professor for sixteen years in some capacity or other before he was confirmed as Professor of Mathematics in the Presidency College! Even Sir T. Muthusawmy Aiyar could only *act* as Chief Justice. He was permitted to soar no higher."

Mr. Pillai's volume is very suggestive as well as informing, and he deserves great credit for placing it before the public in a form likely to circulate its contents much more widely than even the columns of the *Madras Standard*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JUNE, 1896.

Arena. Ghose, Dr. J. N. "Mysore."

Chambers's Journal. "Opium Eating."

Gentleman's Magazine. Reid, D. N. "How India has Suffered in the Race for Wealth."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Hope, Evelyn. "Modern Literature in the N. W. P." "Sir Charles Aitchison's Career." "Indian Gentlemen in the West" (classified list).

National Review. Peel, G. "The Money of the Far East."

Westminster Review. Hewitt, J. F. "Buddhism: The Jataka, or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JUNE, 1896.

Latif, Syad Muhammad ...."History of the Panjab from the Remotest Antiquity to the Present Time. (Sampson Low) .... 18s. 0d.

"Statistical Atlas of India." Second Edition, 1895 (Edward Stanford) .... 5s. 0d.

"List of Ancient Monuments in Bengal." (Bengal Secretariat Press, Calcutta) .... Rs. 12

Mayne, John D.................... "The Criminal Law of India." (Wm. Clowes & Sons) .... — —

"Representative Men of Southern India." (Madras, Price Current Press) .... Rs. 3

"The *Lancet* and the Hyderabad Commission" (423, Strand)............................ — —

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

House of Commons Reports and Papers:—

[127.] East India (Income and Expenditure)—Return of the Net Income and Expenditure of British India for the Eleven Years from 1884-85 to 1894-95 .... 7d.

[151.] East India (Contributions by India to the Imperial Institute)—Correspondence relating to the Contribution from Indian Revenues to the Imperial Institute.................. 8½d.

[154.] East India (Warlike Operations)—Return of the Number of Sailors and Soldiers Killed or Wounded in War or Warlike Operations carried on by the Government of India during 1891 to 1894 .... 1d.

[171.] East India (India Office, Retirement at 65)—Minute by the Secretary of State for India relating to the Retention of certain Officers beyond the age of 65 .... ½d.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.